

8587. Also, letter from New England Antivivisection Society, of Boston, Mass., urging passage of House bill 7884 for the exemption of dogs from vivisection; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8588. Also, petition of 40 residents of the third congressional district of Massachusetts, urging passage of House bill 7884 providing for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8589. By Mr. JENKINS: Petition signed by about 200 citizens, business men, and veterans of Meigs County, Ohio, petitioning Congress to support the Patman bill for the immediate payment of the full face value of veterans' adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8590. Also, petition signed by 34 members of Feeney-Bennett Post, No. 128, of the American Legion of Middleport, Ohio, earnestly requesting a favorable vote on legislation before Congress providing for immediate payment of the full face value of veterans' adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8591. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of Mr. R. G. Hill, departmental chaplain, American Legion, Groesbeck, Tex., urging payment of adjusted-service certificates issued to World War veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8592. Also, petition of Jack C. Barnard, Wichita Falls, Tex., favoring a tariff on oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8593. By Mr. KINZER: Petition of Veterans' of Foreign Wars of Lancaster County, Pa., urging enactment of the bill providing for immediate payment of adjusted-compensation certificates in cash to the veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8594. By Mr. LEA: Petitions of 50 residents of San Anselmo, Marin County, Calif., urging passage of House bill 7884, providing for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8595. By Mr. MENGES: Petition of the Young Women's Christian Association, of Hanover, Pa., and the Lions Club, of York, Pa., asking Congress to so amend the Constitution of the United States as to count only citizens for congressional representation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8596. By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of sundry citizens of the fourth congressional district of Connecticut, urging the passage of House bill 7884, providing for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8597. By Mr. HARCOURT J. PRATT: Petition of M. A. Emerick, Edward J. Yerick, Ella Cooper, Roy Chittenden, Mrs. Henry Tegtmeier, Frank G. Yerick, Grace H. Austin, Jennie Emerick, Clara Zimmer, Minnie Schwarze, Kate Soder, Blanche H. Chittenden, and Carrie Krouse, all of Stottville, Columbia County, N. Y., praying for passage of House bill 7884, to exempt dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8598. By Mr. SHOTT of West Virginia: Memorial of Painter-Porroni Post, No. 1021, Veterans of Foreign Wars, urging the payment of adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8599. By Mr. STONE: Petition signed by Vera Binkley and others, urging the passage of House bill 7884, for the exemption of dogs from vivisection; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8600. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of J. Osburn Lewis, 29 West Pike Street, Canonsburg, Pa., in support of payment at this time of the adjusted-compensation of ex-service men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8601. By Mr. WOLVERTON of West Virginia: Petition of Shirley M. Eye, commercial instructor, Walton District High School, Walton, W. Va., and Homer H. May, principal of the same school, urging Congress to take favorable action on the Capper-Reed bill; to the Committee on Education.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 15, 1931

(Legislative day of Monday, January 5, 1931)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

### PROVISO STRICKEN FROM RULE XVI

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I wish to submit a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield for that purpose?

Mr. MOSES. I do not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire declines to yield.

Mr. MOSES. The Committee on Rules is engaged in the preparation of a new edition of the Senate Manual. We find on page 20-B, in connection with the rule in reference to appropriation bills, this phrase:

*Provided, That this rule shall not apply to the bill making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923.*

I wish to ask unanimous consent to have the proviso stricken from the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Frazier	King	Shipstead
Barkley	George	La Follette	Shortridge
Bingham	Gillett	McGill	Simmons
Black	Glass	McKellar	Smith
Blaine	Glenn	McMaster	Smoot
Borah	Goff	McNary	Steiwer
Bratton	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Stephens
Brock	Gould	Morrison	Swanson
Brookhart	Hale	Morrow	Thomas, Idaho
Bulkeley	Harris	Moses	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Harrison	Norbeck	Townsend
Caraway	Hastings	Norris	Trammell
Carey	Hatfield	Nye	Tydings
Connally	Hawes	Oddie	Vandenberg
Copeland	Hayden	Partridge	Wagner
Couzens	Hebert	Patterson	Walcott
Cutting	Heflin	Pine	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Howell	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Davis	Johnson	Reed	Waterman
Deneen	Jones	Robinson, Ark.	Watson
Dill	Kean	Robinson, Ind.	Wheeler
Fess	Kendrick	Schall	Williamson
Fletcher	Keys	Sheppard	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses], which he will again state.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, in connection with the revision of the Senate Manual, which is being made by the Committee on Rules for the Seventy-second Congress, we find an archaic provision on page 20-B in the rule relating to appropriation bills, there being a proviso as follows:

*Provided, That this rule shall not apply to the bill making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923.*

I have asked unanimous consent that this proviso may be stricken from that rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

### PROPOSED CONSOLIDATION OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I desire to submit an inquiry to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses]. I have a resolution which is pending before the Committee on Rules with reference to the creation of a new committee to handle all veterans' affairs now handled by the Finance Committee and the Appropriations Committee, and also combining with it the Committee on Pensions. I want to ask the Senator what prospect there is of getting a report on that resolution?

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that in connection with the revised edition of the manual, which the Committee on Rules is now preparing, it intends to dispose of all pending matters affecting rules prior to the adjournment of the present session, in order that changes may be carried in the new manual.

Mr. BROOKHART. There are some matters I would like to have submitted for the consideration of the new committee during the present session. If it could be done by the 1st of February I think it would be early enough.

Mr. MOSES. The Senator from New Hampshire is not sufficiently in control of his committee, as the Senator from Iowa is of the committee of which he is chairman, so I can not make that promise. However, I will say to the Senator that there is no disposition on the part of the committee to delay the matter. As I have said to the Senator in private conversation, we have thought it very advisable that any change in the rules should take effect at the beginning of the long session of the new Congress rather than at the end of the short session of the Seventy-first Congress.

Mr. BROOKHART. If the committee adheres to that position I would like to submit the question to the Senate itself.

Mr. MOSES. I will give the Senator ample notice if the committee continues to adhere to that position. I hope the Senator is not so optimistic as to think that legislation coming within the purview of the new committee can be initiated and passed through the Congress before the 4th of March.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. PATTERSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Missouri praying for the passage of legislation for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. TYDINGS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Hyattsville, Md., praying for the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., praying for the passage of legislation for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CAPPER presented resolutions unanimously adopted by the First Church of the Brethren, of Wichita, Kans., praying for the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by a meeting of the business men of Clyde, Kans., favoring the passage of legislation for the regulation of motor bus and truck traffic, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of members of the Christian Science Quindaro Society, of the First Church of Christ, Scientist, and of the Second Church of Christ, Scientist, all of Kansas City, Kans., praying for the passage of the so-called Vestal copyright bill, which were referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH presented petitions of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., praying for the passage of legislation for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented petitions numerous signed by sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the ratification of the World Court protocols, including the so-called Root formula, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### TAXATION OF INDIAN LANDS IN IDAHO

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs two telegrams from the secretary of state of the State of Idaho.

There being no objection, the telegrams were referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOISE, IDAHO, January 14, 1931.

Hon. WILLIAM E. BORAH,

*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

A copy of Senate Joint Memorial No. 2 wired to Secretary of Senate to-day and certified copy being mailed to you, this memorial urges Congress to enact such legislation as will permit United States Government to pay to counties and States in which Indian lands are situated the taxes that would ordinarily be assessed against such lands.

FRED E. LUKENS,  
*Secretary of State.*

BOISE, IDAHO, January 14, 1931.

EDWIN POPE THAYER,

*Secretary of the Senate:*

Senate Joint Memorial No. 2 has been duly passed by the Legislature of the State of Idaho as follows:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent, that—

"Whereas in Idaho and other Northwestern States, there are Indian lands which are not subject to taxation; and

"Whereas the various States and counties in which such Indian lands are situated are obliged to expend vast sums of money annually for the support of State and county governments, and for the building and maintaining of public highways; and

"Whereas such counties and States received no tax revenue from such Indian lands, and this fact is resulting in an undue tax burden upon the property owners generally of the counties and States affected; and

"Whereas it is understood that the Members of the United States Congress are at this time giving consideration to measures relieving such States and counties from such burdens: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America to give careful consideration to this matter and to enact such legislation as will permit the United States Government to pay to said counties and States the taxes that would ordinarily be assessed against said lands: And be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized, and he is hereby directed, to forward this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, and to mail copies thereof to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State."

FRED E. LUKENS,  
*Secretary of State.*

#### EVILS OF ALCOHOLISM

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution in the nature of a memorial from the Church School, of Belle Glade, Fla.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas former Congressman William David Upshaw has called attention to the efforts of the enemies of prohibition, through "wet" publications and otherwise, to miseducate the youth of the United States on the evils of alcoholism, the merits of prohibition, and the desirability of its enforcement; and

Whereas said Mr. Upshaw advises that the United States Government counteract this effort by aiding in the work of educating our young people, notably in the public schools and land-grant colleges, regarding the effects of alcohol on the human system: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Church School, of Belle Glade, Fla., memorialize our United States Senators, Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER and PARK TRAMMELL, and our Congresswoman from the fourth congressional district, Mrs. RUTH BRYAN OWEN, to aid, in all practicable ways, in promoting the above proposal.

Adopted on Sunday, January 11, 1931, unanimously.

THOS. E. WILL,  
*Author and Chairman pro tempore.*

JANUARY 11, 1931.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. FESS, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 228) to provide for the relocation of the statue of Maj. Gen. John A. Rawlins, reported it without amendment.

Mr. BROCK, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11230) to authorize a preliminary examination of Yellow Creek and other tributaries of the Cumberland River in and about the city of Middlesboro, Ky., with a view to the control of their floods, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1300) thereon.

Mr. BLACK, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 13. An act for the relief of the Upson-Walton Co. (Rept. No. 1301); and

S. 1367. An act for the relief of Amos D. Carver, S. E. Turner, Clifford N. Carver, Scott Blanchard, P. B. Blanchard, James B. Parse, A. N. Blanchard, and W. A. Blanchard (Rept. No. 1302).

Mr. BINGHAM, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 120) authorizing the President to reorganize the administration of the insular possessions, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1303) thereon.

Mr. BROOKHART, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 3050) for the relief of James M. Booth, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1304) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 4726. An act for the relief of Alexander H. Bright (Rept. No. 1305); and

S. 5192. An act for the relief of Donald K. Warner (Rept. No. 1306).

#### SALARY OF MINISTER TO LIBERIA

Mr. GOFF. Mr. President, I report back favorably from the Committee on Foreign Relations without amendment the bill (H. R. 9991) to fix the salary of the minister to Liberia. On yesterday the Foreign Relations Committee reached a unanimous agreement that this bill, fixing the salary of our minister to Liberia at \$10,000 a year, which was passed by the House of Representatives on April 7, 1930, should be reported favorably to the Senate.

The salary of \$5,000 now appropriated for the office of minister to Liberia is inadequate. It is less than that received by any other foreign representative in Monrovia. It is disproportionate to the salaries paid to the classified Foreign Service officers of the United States. The British consul general and the general consul at Monrovia in 1925 and 1926 received each a salary of \$7,500 a year, and they were allowed in addition certain sums for entertainment and household expenses. In 1926 and 1927 the British consul general received \$9,272 salary and an allowance of \$2,196, equaling the sum of \$11,468, which is more than double the compensation then paid to the American minister and consul general. The British consul general, in addition, had a house provided for him, in which he resided. The British Legation at Monrovia, owned and furnished completely by the British Government, is a 2-story concrete building with 14 rooms and all modern improvements. It is also my information that Germany, France, and Spain provide adequate quarters for their representatives.

The United States of America has many interests in Liberia, and it is, of course, the duty of the American minister not only to maintain but to advance them in every way possible. Liberia has always regarded the United States as a nation interested in its political, financial, and economic advancement. The missionary interests of the United States in that country involve a hundred missionaries, white and colored, and the religious investments total about \$500,000 and involve an expenditure of about \$300,000 a year. The United States has a large amount of capital invested in the rubber plantations, and there is an American loan to Liberia amounting to about \$5,000,000. The American minister performs both diplomatic and consular functions, and for this dual service he is receiving now only a salary of \$5,000 a year, which is \$5,000 less than is paid to any other minister of the United States. It is \$4,000 less than is paid to Foreign Service officers of the first class and proportionately less than what is paid to other officers of the Consular Service in the lower classes. It is a strange anomaly that one of our ministers should receive a salary lower than a second secretary of one of our legations. The duties of the American minister to Liberia are fairly compared by the State

Department to those performed by our ministers to the smaller Latin American countries. All of these ministers receive \$10,000 a year.

It is further stated that the cost of living at Monrovia for a diplomatic representative is much higher than it is in the United States. It is therefore impossible for the American minister to rent his own home, to do such entertaining as the situation requires, and to maintain his household unless he be a man of large independent means. It is therefore submitted for the reasons stated that H. R. 9991, fixing the salary of the minister to Liberia at \$10,000 a year, and passed by the House of Representatives April 7, 1930, should be passed by the Senate of the United States and become a law at the earliest possible moment.

I observe the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. BORAH] in the Chamber, and I wish to say that I spoke to the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] concerning the matter, and out of order I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the salary of the envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Liberia, when appointed, shall be \$10,000 per annum, and section 1683 of the Revised Statutes and such portions of title 22, section 32, of the United States Code, as fixes the compensation of a minister resident and consul general to Liberia are hereby repealed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was read the third time and passed.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

Mr. BORAH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably the nominations of sundry officers in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service, which were placed on the Executive Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, reported favorably Executive B, Seventy-first Congress, third session, being a treaty with Germany for the extradition of fugitives from justice, signed at Berlin on July 12, 1930, which was placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Commerce, reported favorably the nomination of Lieut. (Junior Grade) (Temporary) John S. Merriman, jr., to be a lieutenant (temporary) in the Coast Guard of the United States, which was placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. MOSES, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably sundry post-office nominations, which were placed on the Executive Calendar.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FESS:

A bill (S. 5725) for the relief of Frank B. Niles, former collector of internal revenue (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 5726) granting a pension to Granville Brown (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5727) granting a pension to Anderson M. Cox (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5728) granting an increase of pension to Maria L. Wood (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 5729) to authorize the Secretary of War to donate certain bronze cannon to the Maryland Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, for use at Fort Frederick, Md.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DILL:

A bill (S. 5730) for the relief of Thomas M. Buist; and

A bill (S. 5731) authorizing the appointment and retirement as a brigadier general, United States Army, of W. R. Abercrombie; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 5732) to authorize the acquisition for military purposes of land in Orange County, N. Y., for use as an addition to the West Point Military Reservation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALE:

A bill (S. 5733) granting an increase of pension to Madona C. Brooks (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5734) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Watson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

A bill (S. 5735) granting an increase of pension to Jennie A. Faries; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

A bill (S. 5736) granting an increase of pension to Burel E. Pollard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOFF:

A bill (S. 5737) for the relief of John M. Moore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 5738) to amend the law relative to the resumption of citizenship by women who lost their United States citizenship by marriage; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana:

A bill (S. 5739) to amend an act entitled "An act to fix the compensation of officers and employees of the Legislative Branch of the Government"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 5740) to amend subsection (a) of section 1 of the act relating to the George Washington Memorial Parkway, approved May 29, 1930; and

A bill (S. 5741) to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901, as amended, by adding a new chapter relating to guardians for incompetent veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 5742) for the relief of Alexander Gilchrist, jr.; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 5743) to authorize 24-hour quarantine inspection service in certain ports of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. REED:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 233) to provide for the erection of a suitable memorial to the Second Division, American Expeditionary Forces; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SMITH and Mr. GEORGE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 234) making applicable for the year 1931 the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1930, for relief to farmers in the flood and/or drought-stricken areas; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. GOFF:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 235) authorizing the placing in the National Statuary Hall of a statue in honor of the American mother and other patriotic women of the United States; to the Committee on the Library.

#### AMENDMENTS TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SHORTRIDGE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 14675, the Interior Department appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 87, line 18, strike out the word "only."

In line 19, after the word "municipalities," insert the following: "Provided further, That if any State or municipality which has entered into cooperation during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, shall cancel or withdraw the whole or part of its funds, the unused balance of the Federal allotment shall be available for mapping national forests, national parks, or other Federal projects."

Mr. HOWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 14675, the Interior Department

appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 117, line 1, after the word "binding," insert the following proviso:

"Provided further, That not to exceed \$250,000 of this fund shall be available for continuation of the investigation of mineral and other resources of Alaska to ascertain the potential resources available which will affect railroad tonnage."

Also, in said line 1, strike out "\$200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$250,000."

#### PRINTING OF THE SENATE RULES AND MANUAL

Mr. MOSES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 402), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be, and is hereby, directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the Seventy-second Congress, and that 2,500 additional copies be printed for the use of the committee, of which 300 copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents.

#### COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, there is a very keen desire to fill the membership of the Committee on Contingent Expenses on account of the necessity of considering the proper funds to carry on certain needed work which must be paid for from the contingent expense fund of the Senate, and to give a new Senator, the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PARTRIDGE], committee assignments. I submit on behalf of the committee the following order, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the order was read and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That Mr. TOWNSEND be assigned to service on the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate;

That Mr. PARTRIDGE be assigned to service on the Committee on Enrolled Bills, the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals, the Committee on Military Affairs, and the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads; and

That Mr. PARTRIDGE be appointed chairman of the Committee on Enrolled Bills.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES AND APPROVALS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On January 13, 1931:

S. 3273. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to issue additional receipts or certificates of mailing to senders of certain classes of mail matter and to fix the fees chargeable therefor.

On January 15, 1931:

S. 4803. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Atchafalaya River at or near Morgan City, La.;

S. 4804. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Atchafalaya River at or near Krotz Springs, La.;

S. 4805. An act to extend the time for construction of a free highway bridge across the Red River at or near Moncla, La.;

S. 4806. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Red River at or near Alexandria, La.;

S. 4807. An act to extend the time for construction of a free highway bridge across the Red River at or near Coushatta, La.;

S. 4808. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Red River at or near Shreveport, La.;

S. 4809. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Ouachita River at or near Sterlington, La.;

S. 4810. An act to extend the time for construction of a free highway bridge across the Ouachita River at or near Monroe, La.

S. 4811. An act to extend the time for construction of a free highway bridge across the Ouachita River at or near Harrisonburg, La.; and

S. 4812. An act to extend the time for construction of a free highway bridge across the Black River at or near Jonesville, La.

#### COMMUNISM AND THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President on the 12th day of January of the present year the able junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE] delivered a very thoughtful and able address before the National Patriotic Council in Washington, D. C., which I ask unanimous consent may be inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The address is as follows:

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR ODDIE, OF NEVADA

Since the early days of our country and the most difficult period of the Civil War, there has not been an issue more important to the Nation's social and economic welfare than the question of communism and the attack which the Soviet Government is now making on our industries and institutions.

The announced intention of the Soviet Government is to provoke and wage a world revolution, and the most unscrupulous methods are being employed for this purpose. The old Marxian theory that "might is right" has been accepted by the communists and the freedom and liberty of the peoples of other nations are challenged. Russia is at war with the world to-day, and is using the implements of propaganda and sabotage and undermining the very foundations of world trade and prosperity by dumping soviet merchandise at artificially low prices on the world's markets.

A year ago we were unconscious of the seriousness of communistic activities in this country and were inclined to regard in a sense of national security the soviet experiment. Had it not been for the excellent work which has been done by Representative HAMILTON FISH, Jr., in conducting hearings throughout the United States and in making available to the public the facts concerning communistic activities, the Nation would still be ignorant and in a defenseless condition. It has required great courage, intelligence, and hard work to conduct this investigation, and having examined the testimony which the House committee inquiring into communism has produced in the published hearings, I feel that no greater contribution has ever been made by any committee of Congress in safeguarding our national security. We are looking forward to the report of this committee as a basis for legislation which will fully protect and safeguard the interests of the United States against the intrusion and attack of the communists. It is, therefore, a distinct privilege for me to have been invited to participate in this dinner in honor of Congressman FISH.

The domestic and foreign trade of the United States should no longer be subjected to the adverse effects of soviet dumping, and for this reason I have introduced a bill, S. 4848, to prohibit the importation of any article or merchandise from the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics. The bill not only includes articles and merchandise mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part in any territory subject to the jurisdiction or control of the government of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics, but also includes such articles and merchandise as may be produced or manufactured in other countries from materials which have been mined, produced, or manufactured in any soviet territory.

The Nation is in the throes of an international depression and confronted by a most serious employment problem. The dumping of soviet lumber, pulpwood, wood pulp, matches, glue, coal, manganese ore, etc., is seriously restricting employment in these industries. The manganese industry, which at the beginning of 1930 was prepared to produce over 200,000 tons of metallurgical grade ore, or more than 25 per cent of the domestic consumption, is now shut down because of the dumping of soviet ore at Pittsburgh at artificially low prices. Should the bill which I have introduced be enacted, it would result almost immediately in the employment of 15,000 men in the manganese industry alone and would provide increased tonnage for the railroads. Many more thousands of men would be put to work in the other industries affected, and tonnage to the railroads would greatly expand. The War Department has very definitely designated manganese as one of the most important war essential metals and, consequently, the soviet attack directed against the development of this industry is especially serious in rendering this Nation incapable of meeting a substantial part of its requirements of manganese from domestic sources of supply. The defense of the Nation is, therefore, greatly endangered.

If an antidumping bill were to include only those soviet products most damaging to domestic industries now, it would not be long before the soviet economic front would be shifted to the production of other commodities equally or even more disastrous in their effects upon our industries. It is necessary, therefore, to exclude all soviet articles and merchandise.

Because of the continually depreciating gold value of the soviet fiat currency in Russia and the correspondingly lessened gold cost of production, soviet export prices can be lowered more rapidly and more extensively than duties can be increased. Since tariff readjustments would prove ineffective in preventing this unfair soviet competition in our domestic market, the enactment of the bill which I have introduced, altogether prohibiting the importation of all articles or merchandise from Soviet Russia, is necessary adequately to protect our industries and to provide that opportunity for employment to which American labor is justly entitled.

Likewise, if an antidumping bill excluded only those articles of merchandise produced from convict labor it would not prove effective, as the Soviet Government would then employ persons who were not convicts, pay them in a depreciated currency, and still be able to export the goods to the United States and other countries at a gold profit. Furthermore, the administration of an antidumping act directed against the production of goods by forced, indentured, or convict labor would be impossible, because the facts concerning production could not be ascertained in Russia. The Treasury Department has been confronted with this problem for several months, and great difficulty has been experienced and no relief afforded under the antidumping act of 1921.

It should be recalled that in 1922 this Government, through the German Embassy at Berlin, made a request of the Soviet Government to send an economic commission to that country to study conditions, and that this request was denied. Since this country is without recourse to enforce legislation to protect itself in any other way, I feel that the bill which I have introduced is not only justified but necessary in establishing an economic quarantine for Soviet Russia. A number of other leading nations have already taken steps to protect themselves from soviet dumping, and if this country enacts a law excluding soviet imports other nations will follow, extending and making effective an economic quarantine.

Under the present conditions of unemployment in the United States I am in entire accord with those who recommend an immigration holiday for this country. We have allowed Russians on a certificate of entry to come into this country, and this courtesy in many instances has been seriously abused. This privilege in the future should be denied by legislation for all time prohibiting the entrance into the United States of citizens of any country not recognized by our Government.

There is little, if any, benefit, however, to be gained from stopping immigration if we are to permit the Soviet Government to participate in our domestic market by dumping products at unfair and artificially low prices and produced largely by convict and forced labor. The importations of such products just as certainly replaces the opportunities for employment of American labor as would the individuals if permitted to come into the United States and compete for employment with American labor.

Every American dollar paid for soviet products dumped here provides employment for the communists in Russia, and to that extent replaces American labor, increasing unemployment in this country. It is unthinkable that Congress will allow this condition to continue. The early enactment of an effective soviet antidumping bill, such as I have introduced, is the first and most important step which can be taken to aid in the solution of the unemployment problem.

It is obvious that the gold credits resulting from the dumping operations of the Soviet Government constitute an additional supply of funds readily available for the purpose of maintaining communist organizations in the United States, in publishing and distributing communistic propaganda, and in staging communistic demonstrations, to the detriment of American ideals and institutions.

Furthermore, most of the soviet articles and merchandise dumped on our market are produced by forced, indentured, or convict labor; and to permit their importation and sale in this country is to perpetuate and enlarge the scale upon which the communist leaders sweat the blood out of the Russian people.

Ex-President Calvin Coolidge, in the Washington Post of November 28, 1930, made the following statement:

"Some years ago a prominent man attracted considerable attention by refusing to purchase some garments at a very low price because he considered that the needlewomen who made them were underpaid. He did not care to profit by their distress. He felt that what he might save in such a transaction was blood money wrung from the unfortunate. He was right."

"There will be general satisfaction in learning that our country, through the National Government, is adopting a like attitude. We wish to protect our own wage earners, our agriculture, and industry from the results of dumping produce on our markets at a price with which they could not compete. But the policy has a deeper significance than that. We are unwilling to profit by the distress of foreign people. We do not want their blood money. Our efforts are not only to protect our own people from cheap goods, which President McKinley said meant cheap men, but we propose to set up a standard that will discourage other nations from exploiting their people by producing cheap goods. Our policy requires fair wages for both domestic and foreign production. We have no market for blood and tears."

It is, therefore, in accordance with American standards immoral and inhumane as well as uneconomic to permit this system of dumping to continue.

Already many organizations, both of a patriotic and of an economic character, have expressed support for the bill which I have introduced, but I desire to quote at this time from a letter received from the National League of Americans of Russian Origin (Inc.), as follows:

"We take the liberty of thanking you for the introduction of the Soviet embargo bill.

"Protecting American labor you protect as well the Russian people oppressed by communists and deprived of all human rights. Your bill will contribute to better relations between the American and Russian peoples in future."

Surely, the American people, when they understand fully what is going on, will unite in protest and will support legislation which will prevent for all time the participation by this country either directly or indirectly in this crime of communism, the most serious international menace with which the world has yet been confronted.

#### THE SILVER SITUATION

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I have a letter from former Senator Charles S. Thomas, of Colorado, inclosing an article which he has prepared for a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations dealing with the whole history of the silver question and its present condition. I ask to have the letter and article printed in the RECORD. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD an article by former Senator Cannon of this body, which was published in the New York Times of the 11th instant, entitled "Silver Loan Proposed as Aid for China."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

The letter and article of former Senator Charles S. Thomas are as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 3, 1931.

HON. KEY PITTMAN,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: In compliance with your request, I have written and herewith submit for your consideration a brief sketch of the progress of silver's demonetization since 1816. It is obviously imperfect, and although long enough for the purpose it is altogether too brief to comprehend a satisfactory synopsis of the subject.

You will note that I have stressed the immediate economic consequences of the successive assaults upon bimetalism by Great Britain and the United States down to the recent Indian coinage act, and emphasized the inevitable result of the depreciation of the purchasing power of silver money not only in silver-using countries but throughout the world. I do not presume that the reaction to such an article will be any more pronounced after the publication of your report than it has been since our own currency act of 1900.

I have another article which is confined to the Treasury incident of 1919 and 1920, which I will discuss with you in the early future.

Cordially yours,

C. S. THOMAS.

#### PERSISTENT BIMETALLISM By Charles S. Thomas

"He would be a bold man who would withdraw silver from that partnership with gold by means of which a sufficient supply of currency was furnished for the whole globe." (Lord Goschen in 1876.)

The relation of gold and silver to each other and of both to the production and interchange of commodities was a primary development of human intercourse. It may be confidently asserted that from the moment when man mastered the secret of gleaning these metals from the detritus of streams and mountains, he employed them as counters in his rudimentary methods of barter and sale, and thus made them his measurements of value. They were difficult to obtain, they were beautiful, they appealed to a general human desire. Moreover, it was perceived that as their production increased the two metals preserved a constant and fairly uniform quantitative relation to each other. With every unit of gold, approximately 14 units of silver would be added to the common hoard; a ratio which, maintained through the ages, persists to this hour. Nature having thus fixed a parity of production man naturally applied it in terms of value; and the ratio of about 15 to 1 between gold and silver was established by common consent centuries before the fact was noted in the records of history. These records beginning A. D. 1687 inform us that the relative values between the two metals fluctuated until 1874, between the narrow extremes of 14.94 and 15.93. Greater discrepancies occasionally appeared which were automatically rectified by a transient greater use of the cheaper metal until the equilibrium was restored. The prevailing ratio of output is about 14 to 1.

Generally speaking, until 1816 this ratio was due neither to edicts nor statutes. It was an inevitable result of the law of relative production, varying with it because always responsive to it. Undue scarcity of one or the other of them from time to time, due generally to artificial or unusual causes, sometimes upset the normal proportion, thus creating serious social and political disturbances, comparable to the hard times, and business depressions of the hour. But with the return of normal conditions, the metallic standards of exchange have automatically adjusted themselves, when "business as usual" resumed its wonted activities.

At intervals the undue disproportion of gold or silver production, due to the discovery of new or more abundant deposits, has seriously disturbed the active affairs of the economic world and

aroused the apprehensions of financiers and economists among industrial nations as to the continuing integrity of prevailing monetary systems and the need for changing or discarding them. The most noted of these was the discovery of gold deposits in 1849 in California and Australia, followed by its unprecedented production, and will be discussed in chronological sequence.

The ancient and universally prevalent institution of bimetalism, generally resting on legal units of silver as standards of value, was the basis of all human activities and recognized as such without serious dissent until 1816. During that fateful year Great Britain quietly discarded the silver pound of Sir Isaac Newton and substituted for it an equivalent quantum of gold as her sole standard of value. Within her dominions silver was thus deprived of its money function, although the fact was not revealed and hardly suspected for 50 years thereafter. This most momentous step in the world's economic history was unheralded and unobserved. Had the fact been otherwise, it would probably have been unheeded, for it concerned a recondite subject which few men appreciated and toward which all men were indifferent. Viewed in perspective, it now bulks large as capital's first and most deadly assault upon the material welfare and prosperity of industrial mankind. The event was a premeditated result of the close of the Napoleonic era and designed to enhance the value of the empire's fixed indebtedness by confining its payment to a single metal or its equivalent.

Rothschild witnessed Napoleon's defeat at Waterloo and fled post haste across the Channel. He preceded all others to London, purchased vast quantities of consols, and then announced the victory. The value of his securities soared to the skies. Europe was desolate, and France bankrupt. Within a twelvemonth England established and has since maintained the gold standard.

It is a remarkable fact that, beginning with 1816, every assault upon or menace to the monetary function of the white metal has been promptly succeeded by a widespread and protracted economic depression, sometimes involving the habitable globe. Other causes occasionally contribute to these disasters, which inevitably follow each other. And it is equally noticeable that all these assaults follow close upon the cessation of war.

The American Civil War ended in 1865, and the Franco-German War in 1871. In 1873 both the United States and Germany demonetized silver, thus forcing the Latin Union to suspend its coinage of that metal. Before the close of that year the United States plunged into the industrial debacle of a general panic, and Germany felt the pinch of hard times. The next seven years was an agonizing period of unemployment. Misery and discouragement, punctuated by shrinking values, an increasing burden of debt, and the startling discovery in America that our supply of hard money had been surreptitiously cut in two, while Germany boasted that gold monometallism had been established to double the burden of French indemnities. In 1875 many Senators and Representatives acknowledged their ignorance of the contents of the Federal coinage and currency act of 1873, and the President of the United States declared that his first knowledge of its real purpose and effect came two years after he had approved it. Bond redemption in coin was succeeded by redemption in gold, and the value of the funded national debt was enhanced by 36 per cent overnight. Market values shrank in like proportion.

In 1856, when gold production nearly quadrupled, Chevalier published his "Decline in the Value" of that metal. He urged its demonetization upon every ground, afterwards pressed against silver money. Scientifically, morally, socially, politically, and physically, the flood of gold meant to him universal disaster unless its money function were destroyed. The nations comprising the Latin Union adopted the silver standard.

England, alarmed at the prospect, enacted a statute compelling the Bank of England to purchase all gold presented for sale at its counters at the fixed sum of approximately \$20 per ounce, and prices rose in sympathy with the rising tide of the yellow flood. But the equilibrium finally came with the rich output of the Comstock mines, whose ores yielded both metals in similar proportion until the ratio rose to 15.93 to 1, or \$1.0368 of silver to \$1 in gold. Since then gold monometallism became regnant, bimetalism was discarded, the face of the monetary world was altered, and silver, constantly in recession, now stands barely above the financial horizon. Values have been wiped out, exchanges revolutionized, and credits multiplied until the world's monetary systems resting on gold have become vast inverted pyramids of constantly increasing proportions threatening a cataclysm that must shake the world.

We are reminded of this approaching collapse by successive assaults on silver money. Efforts to restore its coining privileges have served to sink it deeper into the commercial quicksands. Our demands for free coinage have been answered by acts for compulsory coinage. The Government's privilege of redeeming its paper in silver or gold at its discretion under the act of 1890 was long ago transferred to the banks. In 1893 England abruptly closed her mints to silver coinage, silver fell 16 points in 30 days, money disappeared from circulation, and panic rode the storms of disaster for seven more terrible years. Then came the political demand for bimetalism, with Bryan at the front, only to be overwhelmed by the unlimited campaign fund of Mark A. Hanna.

This defeat was sealed by the vast and unexpected increase in the world's gold production. Mark Sullivan declares, in his history of "Our Times," that the silver issue of the nineties was vanquished by two metallurgists of South Africa, McArthur and Forest by name, who solved the problem of cheap gold extraction from low-grade values, thus bringing millions of tons of hitherto

worthless ore dumps into profitable production. Supplemented by the discovery of huge gold deposits in the Klondike and the Transvaal, the resulting output more than compensated for the rejection of silver in finance, and the day was saved for a time. Bimetallism disappeared from politics, and the gold standard became the accepted measure of values, albeit the need for the white metal in Asia, Central and South America persisted and still persists as an indispensable element in the world's exchanges.

This need was strikingly emphasized by the World War. Early in 1918 England confronted a silver famine in her Indian dominions. Her need was dire. She faced default in the payment of her soldiers and of her commitments for supplies from that country necessary to carry on in Mesopotamia. Failure to meet her obligation meant disaster, revolt, and probable defeat for the Allies. She appealed to America in her extremity, which generously responded by melting up nearly 275,000,000 silver dollars, and transmitting the bullion thus acquired at \$1 per ounce, but providing a corresponding purchase at the same rate for recoining our silver reserve. This saved the Allies, albeit the Treasury Department afterwards repudiated the law by refusing to purchase nearly 45,000,000 ounces of bullion for recoinage. This deliberate betrayal of a legislative mandate was not even protested, although it can neither be condoned nor justified. But it was another nail in the silver coffin, and was doubtless so intended.

Nor was this the only or the most serious offense of the department. Between 1919 and 1921 the bullion price of silver unexpectedly rose to \$1.40 per ounce, the highest point it ever attained. At that figure it commanded a premium of 11 cents over the gold dollar and commerce sang through the Orient as never before. The most propitious time in all history was opportune for the stabilization of the metal. And then again without warning and quietly the blow fell.

Although two acts of Congress, one of them fortified by an Executive order, prohibited under severe penalties the exportation of gold and silver coin or bullion, and although the Pittman Silver Act authorized the melting of silver dollars up to a maximum of 300,000,000 for specific purposes, duly expressed, yet it was provided that for every dollar melted a fine ounce of silver should be purchased from the domestic product at \$1, recoined, and returned to the Treasury. The Federal Reserve Board, combining with the Secretary, set aside the inhibitions of the statutes against exportation of the money metals, and on December 6, 1919, contracted with three international banks in New York to "furnish" them with 13,000,000 silver dollars to be melted and dumped into China for the avowed purpose of depressing the price of silver below the dollar point. These authorities also furnished other agencies with 16,000,000 additional silver dollars for the same purpose, or 29,000,000 in all. The purpose was speedily accomplished, the market value of silver was in May, 1920, forced to 60 cents per fine ounce.

The Government's refusal to purchase and recoin the silver bullion above mentioned was based upon its low current value, which in turn was entirely due to its own conduct. It unlawfully diverted millions of silver dollars into foreign channels in order to break the market; and having done so, it unlawfully repudiated its obligation to restore the melted dollars to the Treasury, because it had fallen below 60 cents an ounce. Having destroyed 29,000,000 silver dollars, to "prevent the price of silver from rising above the point at which the subsidiary coinage would be exported," the department refused to repurchase the bullion because of that fact, although its duty was plain, admitted of no discretion whatever, at a price arbitrarily imposed by law, and in no wise dependent upon market conditions. The Treasury destroyed the market, and because of the fact rejected its statutory duty to replenish the fund. It requires an effort to speak dispassionately of such a flagrant betrayal of statutory duty.

Within a year came the grim harvest. The world experienced another industrial upset. Sixty-cent silver again wiped out the oriental markets for breadstuffs. American agriculture speedily collapsed. Farm relief became an acute problem, still plaguing our people for a solution. Purchases of surplus production have thus far only served to aggravate it. We shall confront it with growing apprehension until we face its real cause, and remove it. Yet all we have thus far done has been to decrease by over 50 per cent, the bullion values of silver, which remained after Secretary Houston's campaign of 1920 against it. No doubt one reaction to this drastic policy has been the increasing disorders in China and swelling discontent in India.

Whatever the fact, Great Britain at once began bestirring itself for "currency reform" in the latter country. The gold standard established for that country in 1900 proved a wretched failure. India absorbed £275,000,000 of gold within a few years, and one-third as much of silver, all of which has disappeared forever. It might as well have been scuttled in the mid-Atlantic. And so, in 1925, the royal commission on Indian currency was created, and charged with the duty "to examine and report on the Indian exchange and currency system and practice, to consider whether any modifications are desirable in the interest of India, and to make recommendations."

On July 1, 1926, the commission made its report, which among other things, noted "the difficulty of keeping the silver rupee in circulation if the price of silver were to rise above the melting point of the coin." When it is considered that the Federal Treasury had brutally crushed its rise above that price shortly before, thereby making the creation of the British Commission an imperative duty, and that the permanent retirement of the silver rupee was foreshadowed as one of its objects, this apprehension, though sounding like sarcasm, was treated as a genuine menace.

For the commission recommended that "the paper currency should cease to be convertible by law into silver coin;" that "no change be made in the legal tender character of the silver rupee;" and that "the silver holdings in the reserve should be very substantially reduced during a transitional period of 10 years. It also declared that under "its proposed scheme for a gold standard and gold currency, silver rupees would cease to be legal tender after a stated period." The scheme would involve the attraction to India of a large additional amount of gold required for currency and the addition of hoards. It would also involve the sale of an amount of redundant silver equal to about thrice the world's production for a year.

The report then stressed the catastrophic fall in the price of silver in terms of gold which would take place on the bare announcement that surplus silver equal to the world production for three years was for sale.

The "bare announcement" of the report was sufficient to produce the catastrophic fall thus apprehended, with its unfortunate consequences. Despite the fact, the Government approved the report and recommended legislation to make it effective. The Indian Parliament complied therewith. The new system supplanted the old, and in 1929 the silver current flowing inward for a score of centuries soon reversed its course, the value of the metal began its last headlong descent, until it now goes begging in the market places of the world at barely 32 cents an ounce. Throughout the Orient want has given way to beggary, values have been destroyed, the money of Asia can buy nothing, the obligations of its people tower to the skies, distress, revolt, banditry, internecine war, and butchery, starvation and pestilence, have overtaken more than half the human race. Yet we are yearning for and predicting a turn of the economic tide, albeit the purchasing power of our former customers has been wiped out by the most devastating course of financial legislation and malpractice with which mankind was ever afflicted.

The world's bankers and business men have wrought for the establishment of the gold standard for more than a century. They have finally succeeded, but the world's economic structures are toppling to ruin. Silver has been stripped of its functions and its values destroyed in the cause of sound money, but the silver-using nations are beggared and the rest of them seriously impoverished, their earning power reduced to the vanishing point, their ambitions quenched, and their enterprise benumbed. Gold, staggering under its colossal burden of credit, is cracking under the strain and must collapse unless relief soon appears, but there is none in sight. Our economic leaders, who are our masters also, persist in their old way, deaf to the warnings of impending collapse, and blind to the rising tides of disaster.

While we shudder at the thought of a communistic world, we have paved the way for its coming. What can be worse than poverty and want imposed upon man by laws and customs which destroy his products, deprive him of his lands, and eat out his substance? Surely no more fertile field than this can be prepared for the reformer fervently proselyting in the cause of a new heaven and a new earth, who would take alike from him who hath and him who hath not, who would feed the hungry with the substance of the well to do, and start afresh when all are degraded to the common level. Should such a catastrophe befall mankind, its primary cause will be found in the economic conditions which have been devised and then perpetuated for making gold the supreme standard of all values. As man multiplies in numbers, as his activities diversify and expand, as his intelligence develops his powers of production, as his wants become more and more insistent, as his structures of credit enlarge with the horizon of his industries, the basis of his expanding system must be broadened and deepened if he would avoid disaster. While his store of gold grew as his business grew, his equilibrium was assured. But his business and credits have been outstripping his golden store, during which period he has heaped new burdens upon it, and thrown aside the silver struts so long supporting the edifice. There is still time for action. But will he wait, instead, until the crash occurs and chaos comes again?

This sounds like declamation. Perhaps it is. Let us hope so. But we can not shut our eyes to many appalling counterfactuals, to only one of which I need refer. Silver converted into anklets, bracelets, and other forms of jewelry have for centuries adorned the bodies of Indian women and been secreted from the public view. They are wedding gifts and dowries constituting their sole belongings. The Indian woman owns them, and owns nothing else. They are her dowry, to be disposed of as she will. She may give them away, or devise them to her children. Before marriage, parents bargain and haggle for them. They may mean life or death to the owners. In times of stress they may become the sole means of subsistence. Hence, some conception may be formed of the prodigious quantity of silver bullion and rupees which during the centuries have been made into bracelets and anklets and welded on the bodies of women as their sole and only belongings. The consequences to these poor creatures when parliaments, and congresses, and secretaries, and ministers of finance so make laws, and administer them, that the value of their scant belongings shall fall away and shrivel into nothingness may be appreciated. It may be affirmed that of the more than seven billions of rupees which these widely distributed items of modest ownership would have readily commanded in 1924, four-fifths have within the past 10 years been destroyed by law; gone utterly, invisibly, without a sound and without warning. Their miserable holders retaining the mere vestige of their former wealth, neither know how their misfortunes have come nor how soon they will be stripped of the little that remains. Their collective losses, react-

ing to world's affairs, reveal the fundamental causes of its own conditions. Not until such wrongs are righted, and those despoiled secure their restitution can we be sure that the end of our own industrial agony is at hand. Can we not realize this and strive to attain it? If we fail to do so, we may be sure that the gold standard will not long survive the awful sacrifices which have been made to establish it.

The remedy is at hand if only we will avail ourselves of it. The machinery for suggesting and organizing an International Monetary Conference was written into our statutes over 33 years ago. Is our President big enough and courageous enough to perceive his opportunity, disregard the counsel of those interests and influences which have effectuated our present entanglements, strive to place gold and silver upon a common monetary basis, and start the world once more upon the real highways of progress?

Or will he and his advisers persist in treading the same old highway strewn with the wrecks of an unnatural and impossible financial system tottering under an inadequate standard, whose burden grows as its basis narrows, but sustained by optimistic visions of an industrial millennium, whose beginnings are said to be just around the corner, and whose advent is assured by the confident forecasts of the self-appointed, experienced, and far-seeing captains of modern industry. Whatever his course he must select and travel it promptly, for he can neither evade nor ignore the crisis very long.

The article by former Senator Frank J. Cannon is as follows:

[From the New York Times, January 11, 1931]

**SILVER LOAN PROPOSED AS AID FOR CHINA—STABILIZATION OF THE VAST COUNTRY WOULD HELP OUR TRADE, SAYS FORMER SENATOR**

(The following article by the former Senator from Utah is of especial interest in view of the announcement from Washington last week that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee would soon receive a report from a subcommittee in favor of an international loan to China in the interest of world trade.)

By Frank J. Cannon

More than one-fifth of the people of this globe live in China. They and the other inhabitants of Asia number 1,030,000,000 of the earth's population of 1,950,000,000. As its past has been the longest known, so China's future is the most important among world problems.

China is now passing through the pains of parturition. It is with a new China, with all its potencies, that western peoples must soon come into closer relationship—beneficial to all if wisely established or injurious to all if we shall make heedless or cruel blunders. After her many centuries China is entering upon an experience which may be like our own, except that it will be larger and probably more speedy in its fruition than was the growth of power and influence of the United States, which up to our day is the transcendent national achievement of mankind.

#### STABILIZATION OF CHINA

We have the utmost need that China shall be stabilized to assure the peace of the world and to give opportunity for our commerce. That stabilization is being effected gradually but surely. The President of the Republic, head of the National Government, Chiang Kai-shek, seems to be succeeding in his mighty task of subduing rebels and marauding forces. Apparently he has preferred to attain this end by force of arms rather than by bribery.

He is confronted now by a problem which grows larger and more acute with every victory. The soldiers falling off from the armies have no legitimate occupation and many of them go into bandit hordes or become available in their desperate need for the movement of the Russian Soviet. This teaching has no natural place in the disposition of the Chinese. Every tradition, every custom, would be opposed to it. But when men are hungry and homeless they do not judge by the standards of life which prevail when they are in the midst of peace and plenitude.

It has been testified by experts that the great material need of China is for a system of roads and canals and adequate means of transportation by land and water. And we travel in an evil circle if we assume that these ends can be attained only after the social conditions shall be fully settled in China. This great work should precede, or at least should accompany, the intelligent and forceful effort which is making to establish political security. But the essential is lacking—money. Just as our trade, import and export, with China has fallen during the year past, with the threat of still more ominous decline, so the internal commerce of China has fallen to its lowest known status.

Dr. Julius Klein has testified that our potential market is the Orient. China is the choicest part of that market. For the moment we have saturated the buying power of our own people. Ask any large manufacturer in the United States what he most needs and he will answer markets. At this time our power of mass production has made a surplus over and above our ability to consume. We must find other consumers. China has more than three times our own population. Frugal as they are, they are among the best consumers in the world. They save a trifle, but they spend more in proportion to income than we of the United States.

#### CHINA'S BUYING POWER

But we have almost destroyed the buying power of China. This has been accomplished in part through measures calculated by people reckless of the consequences and partly without prescience of the result.

The Orient for 4,000 years has been using silver as money. Of its more than 1,000,000,000 people, probably nine-tenths of them never saw gold as money and could not use it as money. As remarked by an American who had lived in China: "You can not pay a man 15 cents a day out of a gold piece." And the Chinese do not believe in paper even if it could be based on gold. They want their day's wages in metal which they can understand.

As silver in China has fallen to about 35 cents an ounce from its former price of \$1.30, it follows that we have reduced the buying power of China's silver about 70 per cent, and this is true of all the silver in the Orient—of all the world for that matter. If you take away three-quarters of the buying power of the money of more than 1,000,000,000 people, do you need to look elsewhere for a primary cause of world depression?

But in China there is a not unnatural by-product of this diminution of buying power. While silver had a fixed place the Chinese hoarded their little savings. But with the falling, in addition to the fact that it took 4 ounces to purchase what formerly 1 ounce would buy, the degradation of silver made everyone desirous of getting rid of it while it still retained a little purchasing power. Hence the silver of China has flowed into the treaty ports and is held there largely for speculative purposes. The back country of China has little or no silver as money or available for money purposes.

It is into the back country of China that a great movement must be made. It is here that scores of millions must find work and wages for their livelihood; it is here that they must grasp the principles of democracy; and it is here that they must be made participants in the nationalization.

What the Chinese need in that great back country is a medium of exchange. They need the work and the wages which a supply of that medium of exchange would give.

It is believed that China has about 800,000,000 ounces of silver stored at the treaty ports. It is an assured fact that in the back country she has none worthy of mention. Chinese peasants and artisans, no more than American farmers, can get along without a medium of exchange; therefore our first action might very well be to supply to the National Government of China something which that Government could use and which its people would gladly accept as money—viz, silver. And we must do this without any interference with the gold standard, which is the basis of money and credit transactions throughout the western world.

#### A SUGGESTION

As a means to that end I am submitting to Senator PITTMAN's committee—a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Exchange—this suggestion:

That the Government of the United States lend silver bullion to the nations which are in need of bases and rehabilitation of finance and industry. In return, borrowing nations to issue bonds, payable, principal and interest (if any interest) in silver bullion by weight. Such borrowed bullion to be minted and put into circulation by the borrowing countries under conditions fixed by the United States.

An act of Congress could provide for the loan for the replacement of silver bonds for bullion, or for the purchase of equivalent bullion in the domestic market, as the basis for our silver currency outstanding.

If our Government should undertake loans to China and other countries, it would be essential to have carefully planned negotiations with the leading statesmen of European countries and also Mexico and Canada. As rapidly as bullion could be properly absorbed by borrowers the quantity would be increased up to, say, 8,000,000,000 ounces.

If our Government does not accept the opportunity, our commercial powers ought to seize this chance to enlarge their markets by cultivating the purchasing power of more than 1,000,000,000 potential consumers.

If neither the Government nor the commerce of the United States cares to act, the whole plan can be executed by Great Britain, which is seeking to provide markets for the product of 3,000,000 artisans now idle.

#### A LOAN BY WEIGHT

It will be observed that the salient point of this proposal is to lend silver by weight, repayable, principal and interest, by weight. This cuts through the whole question of money, of ratio, of exchange. Neither the transaction of lending nor the transaction of repayment needs any translation into dollars.

We have in the Treasury of the United States more than 400,000,000 ounces of silver. It is true that against the silver dollars stored in the Treasury has been issued paper currency, but the stability of the paper dollar is not in the silver, for there is but 25 cents worth of that metal behind the piece of paper which we call a dollar. If the Government's credit can stand for 75 cents, the Government is good for 100 cents—particularly if there should be substituted for the bullion a reliable promise to restore the bullion.

We need to help China. Our commerce must find an outlet or our wheels of industry must further slow down. It is not the work and wages of China alone but it is the work and wages for the people of America that we must consider.

In five years, according to special dispatches to the New York Times, it would appear that more people have perished of starvation in the Republic of China than died from war causes throughout the world during the World War. What right have we to go on in the smug self-sufficiency of unconsumed and unconsumable surplus while millions die in want of the very things which

go to demoralizing waste here? Sometime we shall have to answer. Retribution waits upon nations as well as upon individuals.

#### THE BUSINESS SITUATION

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] which appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune on December 28, 1930, relating to the current business situation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ECONOMIC LAWS DISREGARDED

"What's the matter with business, Senator?" was the first question I asked him when I met him recently.

While slow in movement, deliberate in speech, Senator SHIPSTEAD does not hesitate in his answers. Neither does he give one the impression of being rushed or hurried in his thinking.

"Perhaps the greatest handicap of business," he replied, "is the refusal of the leaders in government, finance, and industry to recognize well-established laws of economics and, therefore, refuse to admit that something is the matter with business."

Senator SHIPSTEAD has never been a revolutionist. He is not even radical, in the popular sense of that term. He is a conservative at heart, an old-fashioned constitutionalist. He does not object to being called radical, if one uses it in its exact meaning of "going to the root of the matter."

"Mussolini says the trouble with business is the stock-market crash in New York," continued the Senator, "The British say it is due to all of the gold being in France and the United States and to our tariff wall. The Germans say it is due to reparations. American leadership, up to this time, has been saying the trouble is due to conditions in Europe and the rest of the world. Now, all of these are partly right, like the blind men who were asked to describe an elephant."

#### DIFFERS FROM 1920

"The one who felt of his leg said the elephant resembled a tree. The one who got hold of his tail said the elephant resembled a rope; and one, who caught his trunk, said he was more like a snake; while the one who felt his body said he resembled a house more than anything else."

"In your opinion, is the present depression similar to that of 1920?" I asked.

"Well, some say that this depression will disappear quickly, like the depression of 1920," the Senator went on at length. "But in 1920 the world was a vacuum, as far as food and commodities were concerned. The force of this vacuum practically sucked commodities out of the United States, giving us tremendous exports, for which the world had to pay in gold. When they had no gold, we loaned them the gold credits with which to buy. In 1920 I said that it would take 10 years for the world to get back to normal production and the normal carry-over of surplus. The world was beginning to catch up as early as the spring of 1925, when the decline in prices started. This decline was checked temporarily by heroic use of powerful credit pumps, not only here but abroad."

"Our Federal reserve banking system was so manipulated as to inflate credits. This in turn stimulated production both here and abroad. On account of our export of commodities and credit, loans to Germany, and reparations, gold concentrated in the United States and France. Thus other countries were not able to get gold with which to buy from us."

#### TARIFF STARTED DEBACLE

"The British Government, in putting India on a gold basis, demoralized silver. This in turn reduced the purchasing power by 50 per cent of 1,000,000,000 people in the Orient. Nothing else could happen but what did. The bubble had to burst."

"Then in your opinion, an unwise manipulation of money and credit was a major factor in bringing on the crisis?" was my next question, and the Senator continued:

"A credit system can stand only so much inflation, just like a balloon or a rubber tire; when it bursts, we have deflation. The selling of stocks on the New York Stock Exchange started in London within 30 days after the Ways and Means Committee reported the last tariff bill to the House. This was largely a fear complex, thinking that the increased tariff would so decrease their sale of British goods in the United States that they would not be able to accumulate sufficient gold credit to pay their American debts."

"Then you do not believe that any one factor contributed to the present business debacle?" I asked.

The Minnesota Senator has a way of looking his listener straight in the eyes and answering deliberately. He went on:

"There were many contributing factors. I think in turning to the gold standard, England pegged the pound too high and France pegged the franc too low. The transfer of debts from allied taxpayers to American taxpayers, making possible the building of large armies and navies in Europe, is also, in my opinion, a contributing factor. In this country, through special-privilege legislation, too numerous to mention here, Supreme Court decisions, and the lack of enforcement of the Sherman antitrust laws, a condition has arisen where an unfair share of the national income is drained from agriculture and labor for the benefit of corporate incomes."

#### NO MONEY TO BUY WITH

"This has largely destroyed the purchasing power of the 70,000,000 people who work on the farms and in industry. What's the result? Production has outrun consumption because the great masses of our people, the working people, have no money to buy goods with. Can you ever remember the time when the farmer and the working man did not buy when they had the money? They always have."

"The hoarding of income in the form of surplus by corporations in order to escape paying income taxes and loaning the money to Wall Street speculators was another factor which helped destroy the purchasing power of the people."

Then the Senator handed me a slip of paper, quoting a speech which he made on January 21, 1925, in analyzing the foundation of the stock-inflation boom, which was then just beginning. In that speech he said:

"It seems scarcely necessary to comment upon such a condition. The facts speak louder than any denunciation that can be framed. The facts are from former ex-cathedra sources, from New York leading financial authorities, and from Federal reserve reports. They tell their own story to the country at large; the story of a Wall Street stock market 'jamboree' financed by Wall Street control; the purpose for which the Federal reserve was originally created has been destroyed and the Government agency turned into a force to perpetuate and magnify the evil. The result is called the prosperity of the American people and sound finance. \* \* \* Even now, we know not what hour the bubble may burst and the 1924 stock inflation, like others before it, produce disaster to the many and bring on a panic."

#### DISCUSSES BANKS

The subject turned to banks and banking procedure, for the year 1930, judged both by the number of banks closed in the United States and by the total assets involved, has been the most disastrous year in American banking history.

"Industry is too often dominated by banks," said the Senator. "Banks, in turn, are too often dominated by men who are trained as 'high-pressure bond and stock salesmen,' who seem more interested in underwriting and floating dubious bonds and stock issues, both foreign and domestic, to gullible investors than in doing a legitimate banking business."

"And these bond salesmen, who seem to be dominating so many of our banks, seem again often to be dominated by so-called 'economic advisers,' and, judging from various reports which they have issued from time to time upon questions of economics, these advisers lead one to believe that many of them ought to be in insane asylums."

Well, the Senator at least is candid and frank. He does not mince his words. And he believes, too, that "a full diagnosis of the business ills is most important right now, for we can not furnish a remedy unless the people understand the need for it."

#### RELIEF OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Miss Helen Hall on the unemployment situation, entitled "Shall We Stick to the American Dole?" which appeared in The Survey for January, 1931.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

[From the Survey, January, 1931]

SHALL WE STICK TO THE AMERICAN DOLE?

By Helen Hall

There is nothing seasonal in the need for food and shelter. The workingman faces a steady demand for his wages in the face of a fluctuating need for his work. "You just can't do with odd jobs and a family," says Mrs. Raymond to her neighbor. "You've got to have that pay envelope every week, or the children don't eat."

It is obvious that the regularization of industry can not be carried out by the man whom it most directly affects. We put that up to management. But it seems to be assumed that by some miracle he and his family can underwrite the irregularity of industry.

Our analysis of the 150 case stories which will make up the permanent record of the settlement study of unemployment throws light on how such households try to underwrite it and what it costs them. Here were 150 homes in a prosperous country and in a prosperous epoch—for our findings were gathered in the months that preceded the stock-market crash of 1929. They exhibit the risks which will be encountered by American wage earners when business gets back to "usual." Here were 150 families dislodged from their means for subsistence for reasons outside of themselves—for they do not include families where strikes, sickness, habits, or other personal causes were dominant. Here were 150 breadwinners eager to shoulder the burden of livelihood if they were given a chance—for after following Jerry on his morning rounds or walking the streets all day with Mr. Zarone; after reading the testimony of Harry Silverman, 12 years in one place, who searches for five months for another, and of Mrs. Raymond who puts pasteboard in her husband's shoes, cotton in his heels, and a brace back of his knee, as an aid in his tramp for work, it

is not easy to cherish the idea that in normal times every man who really wants a job can find one.

Let us run over the sequence of makeshifts these families resorted to and ask ourselves whether any or all of them seem satisfactory provisions for safeguarding such homes. Satisfying, that is, to our own sense of responsibility and fair play as well as to theirs.

The control of the business cycle, if we ever achieve it, will help cut down the numbers of breadwinners who seek work and can not find it. Industrial stabilization will help and so will the long-time planning of public works so that public enterprises may be pushed when private industry falls off. An efficient system of employment services which will shorten the out-of-work period will help in another way. But no one who scans the ups and downs of American business enterprise, our changes in technique and styles and markets, the shiftings of industry from one region to another, can but see that there will still be need for protection of some sort against unprevented and unpreventable unemployment over which the workers themselves have no control.

We have been slow to extend to this hazard of broken work the principle we have applied so successfully to industrial accidents by workmen's compensation laws which spread a share of that risk over our costs of production. When unemployment insurance is mentioned in this country there is often the cry, "We don't want the dole here," by people who do not realize that we are relying on makeshifts which are much more demoralizing than any plan of insurance would be. Our settlement study uncovers the economic and physical handicaps with which families confront life when the wage earner at length finds reemployment—not in all cases, of course, but in such numbers that the trend is unmistakable. They confront it with savings used up, with debts to friends and stores, with homes lost, or with furniture and clothing and other equipment for living sadly in arrears; with health depleted and earning power impaired.

No attempt was made to tally up the loss in wages suffered by our 150 families, yet in the course of a single year the total must have run over a hundred thousand dollars; and the butcher, the baker, the business and professional groups in their communities were affected by this drain which undermined the household structure of the families themselves.

Our case stories offer cross sections of human experience in trying to make good these lost earnings.

#### SAVINGS

Savings are the first cushion; cash savings first of all. Many of our families had small savings, but there is nothing in their experience to show that high wages are general enough or continuous enough for savings to give any general security. The economists tell us that for three-quarters of the population of the United States the margin between income and necessary outgo is so close as to allow little or no leeway for emergencies. In one out of five of our cases it is recorded that the families had used up whatever cash savings they had. When it has taken 15 years to save \$700, as it had the DePesas, of Boston, and you wipe it out in one winter of unemployment, you have lost something more than the \$700. You do not start again with the same spirit. In 1 out of 10 of the cases—especially those where the work had been seasonal or where there were a larger number of children or there had been previous sickness—the families had not been able to lay by for a "rainy day." Or, as one family put it, it "rained too soon."

Those of us who have followed them in their long line of retrenchments know that not one step is taken without a struggle. After the cash savings are gone insurance policies lapse. We might well pause at this point, for no family gives up its insurance without a fight. They are small policies, most of them, enough to see them through a decent burial, but they mean something almost symbolic to the poor. The fear of not being able to bury their own dead haunts even the least independent.

There are few families whose ideal is not sometime to own their own home. A house is savings if you own it or are buying it bit by bit on installments. This instinct for home ownership survives in spite of discouraging fluctuations in real-estate values in industrial neighborhoods. Many of our immigrant peoples come from countries where their families have lived for generations on the same little plot of ground. The instinct to own with them is deep-seated. They are willing to put up a fierce struggle to have it satisfied. That struggle must be watched close at hand to understand its full significance. A dozen of our families had engaged in it, only to find the home they had worked for, which had stood for security to them, become a back-breaking load once their earning power was cut. They were in arrears in their payments, behind in their interest on mortgages, and some of them faced foreclosure. The La Forges, of Minneapolis, had paid \$2,000 against \$3,500 on the house they lived in. Their furniture had cost \$1,100 and was all paid for. When the La Forges came to the attention of the settlement they had lost their house and sold their furniture, and the five members of the family were all living in one room. It takes little imagination to guess what had happened to the morale of the family by the time they arrived in that single room.

Furniture is savings, and we find furniture sold or, more often, lost to the installment collector. That was the way with the Morans' piano in Boston, which had almost been paid for. Then their parlor furniture went. The installment house stripped the rooms of the De Macios, of Pittsburgh, and left only mattresses, broken chairs, and a hot plate. It meant more than the actual loss of furniture when the young Greens had saved \$1,500 over

five years to buy their furnishings and were forced to sell them for \$200. These material things stand for steps along the line of respectability and progress. They mean not only parlor furniture but the place you take in your community; your being able to have your friends in; your daughter meeting her boy friend at her own home instead of on the corner.

And some more intimate things that we treasure are savings. Dorothy Doheney, in Boston, in order to meet her rent, insurance, union dues, and the installment payments, pawned her wedding ring. The Benders, in Cleveland, had no furniture they could sell, so it was the mother's engagement ring that was put in hock. The Jameses, in Salt Lake City, pawned both the mother's wedding ring and the father's watch. The Zapellis pawned their little girl's communion ring to pay for the mother's dental work. She was just 30, but when they found it would cost more than the ring brought in, she had all her teeth pulled out.

The deeper we got into our case schedules the more clearly we came to appreciate the slenderness of savings as a buffer to misfortune. Nor can we feel that they are a convincing answer to the need for security against industrial changes.

#### BORROWINGS

What is the next line of defense these families fall back upon? They borrow. Families without houses, furniture, or articles which can be sold or pawned are thrust quickly on the mercy of the landlord and the grocer. To the members of a household who have paid their rent promptly and hold their heads high in the neighborhood this running into debt is a humiliating business and the daily facing of creditors adds to the strain which is put upon family relationships. Hilda and Herman Richter had been able to save on \$18 a week and their upstanding part in the community had been a great source of satisfaction to them. It is especially noted in their case that when Herman's earnings stopped and they got behind, he it was who saw the creditors. But it is the wife generally who faces them or tries to elude them. You come to the front door and find it locked, the curtains are down. No one's at home. But if your rap is known, you may find the mother in the kitchen waiting for a chance to steal out and avoid the collector. One out of five of our families ran up bills for groceries, coal, milk, and other necessities. "I can tell you what unemployment has done for us," said Mr. Conway, of Louisville. "It has got us so deeply in debt that we can never pull out."

And whether it is the wage earner's family that thus eats up his future earnings, or the small shopkeeper who carries them and runs into bankruptcy all the faster if he has a heart, we can not think it good public policy thus to let things drift from bad to worse.

#### CHARITY

Society does not, of course, leave such families altogether to their own devices. When other resources have been exhausted, and in most instances only then, the family asks for charity. Before they were through a third of our families had done so—but often only after a long struggle. Some few became pauperized, but many could never reconcile themselves to accepting help from strangers.

Often even charitable relief is difficult to obtain for a family where there is an able-bodied man. John Schneider, of New Orleans, wanted to kill himself because he felt that his family would get help if it were not for him. Young Mr. Miller, in Pittsburgh, refused for a long time to ask for aid because he was a young man, able and willing to work, and was ashamed to receive it from any agency. Mrs. Amay says: "We never asked help from no one. We couldn't bear to let no one, even our own people—and they couldn't help us anyway—know of our trouble, but when the children needed food we had to tell some one. The nurse came in and found me crying, so I told her." Mr. Estrada developed a bitter attitude toward life, feeling that a man willing to work should be able to find it. He so resented charity that he refused to eat food that came from sources outside the family connection. Mr. Blanton was keeping a record of the money loaned him by the Welfare Society and hoped some day to repay. He admitted, however, that he was losing self-respect and felt that he would lose his mind unless he could find work.

Social work has made advances in the deftness with which it helps adjust family troubles, but social work can scarcely underwrite the load of unemployment in its great cyclical manifestations. There is not the money to do the job. Emergency funds are makeshifts, and emergency relief crowds out the constructive work of the agencies. But in good times or bad, to the families of the unemployed, relief from such sources comes more often than not as an added misfortune. They lose something, as they see it, when they take help, even if the cause for asking for it lies outside their own control. It means a serious break in family pride and self-confidence, a self-confidence which seldom blossoms again with the same sturdiness. But even if it covered the ground, charitable relief would not be a convincing answer, either, to industrial dislocation in a democracy.

#### OTHER MAKESHIFTS

Our families turn to other makeshifts they have worked out themselves. They move to cheaper quarters, they break up the home, they cut down on conveniences, on clothing, on food. But are these the workings of a providence that fits our modern world? A bread line stands out like a silhouette of misery in our memories. The relief lines that I came upon at the municipal stations in Detroit last winter, and the employment lines at the plants, etched themselves deeply. But there is another slow-moving procession of which we catch only fragmentary glimpses, but which if it

could be run before us like a film would leave us with still less peace of mind. That is the search for cheaper quarters on the part of the families of men out of work. Here, in a very tangible way, they beat a retreat—into fewer and fewer rooms, into apartments with less and less comfort, into basements, and into fire traps on which no rent is collected. We find the Mullins moving out to a little unpaved street in Atlanta, the Handels to the lane in the hollow under Meadow Street bridge in Pittsburgh, where the mud was ankle deep. There is not a squalid street along the water fronts of New Orleans or New York, Boston or Buffalo or Chicago and our other port cities that has not harbored such families as they settle to lower levels.

In the course of it all they sacrifice those conveniences which we associate with the American standard of living. The apartment to which the Mullins moved, for example, had no bath and only an outside toilet. The 2-room shack that the Handels found was little better than a woodshed with its lack of heat and light and water. But even if the family stays on in the same house, what we call the necessities of life may drop out. The gas is shut off. Our neighbor, Mrs. White, kept her household sitting in the dark, evenings. "Our gas is a 25-cent meter and we didn't have it unless we had the quarter." Repeatedly we hear of lodgers and boarders being "taken in" and between the lines this may mean overcrowding beyond the limits of decency. As many of our families took in boarders as moved. It was an expedient to stave off moving. A line of escape lies in breaking up the home altogether. Among young couples the man goes back to his people, the wife to hers, and, if there are children, takes them with her. In some instances the children are "put away" in some charitable institution; and in Philadelphia we have had the anomaly these years that while neither the city nor the private philanthropies have had money enough for families out of work, there were always the orphanages and other children's institutions. We could break up a home but we could not hold it together.

It is hard to think that these disruptions of family life and standards are desirable ways to meet the difficulties such households confront. We can sense the helplessness of individuals who thus try to adjust themselves to the changes of industry, with the grocery bill rolling up, back rent accumulating, the house growing cold in the face of unsteady employment.

#### CUTTING DOWN ON FOOD

And as the assault on everyday living presses more and more inexorably, the families dig themselves in deeper. As Mrs. Cardini in New York put it, "You know what we do? If we pay the rent and there isn't enough left, you know what we do. If we're going to live honest, you know what we do." "We eat little—that's what we do," broke in her little girl, thinking her mother had not made herself clear. The Tioris of Boston "pulled in their belts." The Giamios of Madison fed their children all the time on potatoes and bread, with beans for meat. The Monterey children in New Orleans picked up scraps of meat and vegetables cast aside in the market. One winter the Bertleys, with their four children, managed on less than \$5 a week for groceries. This meant that this Atlanta family ate only two meals a day consisting of corn bread, salt meat, and dried beans. When Mrs. Bertley had fainting spells, they finally got her to a doctor who said that she was not getting enough to eat.

But let two of our Philadelphia mothers tell for themselves how they managed.

Mrs. White: "I just saw Harry and Joan starving to death before my eyes. Then the first time I ever got a card with 'malnutrition' written on it from the school was after their father lost his \$25 job and took one at \$21; and then last winter when he was out both Margaret and Brother got 'malnutrition' written on their cards again. The children seldom get any meat, perhaps on Sunday if I can manage it, and never any desserts."

Mrs. Kirk: "They are so used to going without food that they can't eat much when they do get it. They don't say much, but they know when there's nothin'."

Cutting down on food then is one thing the family does for itself. In every third of our neighborhood cases, the families had done it so radically as to prompt the investigator to remark upon it; in a fourth of them the physiological effects were obvious enough to be noted by a layman. Underweight, stunted growth, anemia, rickets recur again and again in the entries. There is the sequence of colds, pneumonia, tuberculosis. Repeatedly it is noted that the families go without needed medical treatment, that teeth are neglected, and necessary operations postponed. The extreme is reached in babies born only to die because of insufficient food and the exhaustion of the mother.

The unmistakable evidences of malnutrition among these families and the prevalence of sicknesses that have roots in a weakened resistance would not lead us to think lightly of cutting down on food as something society should encourage as a recourse against unemployment.

#### THE MOTHER GOES TO WORK

There is still another reserve that the family finds within itself. The mother goes out to work—for she can often get a job when the man can't. Here, in order, are the case numbers where this happened: 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 18, 20, 23, 24, 32, 37, 49, 55, 56, 59, 65, 67, 68, 79, 83, 88, 91, 92, 93, 101, 102, 104, 105, 107, 109, 113, 119, 121, 128, 134, 139, 140, 142, 143, 145, 147. When the bankers and industrialists, the engineers and managers have not in their organization of industry enough work for the men, enter Mrs. Jenkins, Mrs. Levy, Mrs. Carbino, Mrs. Kurfee, and the rest.

When unemployment first comes the husband and wife most often face the situation together. But they fall apart as the wife

is harried by debt collectors, the rent man, the insurance man. She sees the children half fed and getting thin, often sick, and needing clothes she can't buy; and, too, she may be working herself and adding fatigue to worry. In the first days of her husband's job hunt she is sympathetic and fights to keep his courage up and defends him in the neighborhood. The poignancy of his struggle has not been lost in her own discouragement. I remember when Mrs. White came round to tell of her husband's first pay envelope after nearly a winter's search. "You know," she said, "the look on his face when he gave it to me was like a child with a Christmas present." But that was his first winter out. Now, facing the third one, the Whites no longer present a united front. She doesn't believe he tries and is bitter against him, and he no longer cares very much, for he has the gang and is "in on the bottle as it is handed around," and only comes home late to sleep. The strain and disappointment vent themselves in sharp words. "There were no ugly words in our house when he was workin', but I'm so tired now I don't know what I'm saying," as Mrs. White put it. And to come home from anything as disheartening as "makin' the rounds," only to be accused of not really trying doesn't make for harmony. The blame the husband gets sometimes only bespeaks a nervous strain on the part of the wife, but often she has read in the papers of prosperous times, and that adds to her distrust of her husband's earnestness in his job hunt. "If other men get jobs, as the papers say, why can't he?"

Insanity, suicide, and desertion are some of the more startling consequences of the emotional strain which preys on such families in the wake of discharge. Take the story of Tioris, the hand laster of Boston, who had seen his pay envelope flatten from week to week. When finally he brought home only \$3 he tried to hang himself. And the cases abound in the results of the double load on the mother's shoulders when she goes out to work to help tide things over. Mrs. Moran was taken ill from lifting too heavy pails of water in her cleaning job. After two months on her back she returned to work. Mrs. Walther, who had been doing part-time work, undertook a full-time position. She went on 12-hour night duty at a hospital. In this way she was able to keep her home and take care of her son during the day. Several months of this was followed by a nervous breakdown and months as a patient herself in a hospital. Mrs. Cardini stays up until 1, 2, or 3 o'clock every night trying to keep the house clean and the children's clothes fit to wear to school. "Maybe next summer, if he gets a job, I'll get a chance to rest up," she says. "A near-by neighbor of ours in Philadelphia cleaned offices in the daytime and again at night. Her children were asked when she slept. 'Oh, she puts her head down on the table after supper,' they said, 'and sleeps until she goes out at 10.'"

Those of us who watch the women of our unemployed coming to the rescue in this way know that in their courage and their devotion these cases are not exceptional. But even if they rise to it, that can not satisfy those of us who look on.

#### SCRAPPING PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

Still less can we be content that in one out of three of such households there are children who can be taken from school and put to work, as was done in these families. Surely that is not the recourse we are looking for.

Along with the children's education go the things that make for interesting and creative living at home. And even when they are kept at school they can not pass through all this untouched. The psychologist and psychoanalyst give us some understanding of what a background of strain and bad feeling can do to the growing child. As with adults, children react differently to family tension. In some the spirit isn't strong enough to break through, but the majority of children unconsciously elude as best they can the pressure of trouble in their home. I have in mind a little friend of ours, called Aggie, who took her small person out of it as soon as she waked in the morning, and often she was picked up from neighboring doorsteps at night. She spent every possible moment in our settlement, and when in the evenings there were no activities for very little girls she would find some reason to go to the dispensary. It was warm and light and friendly, and she would sit waiting her turn. Once when she was told that the dentist couldn't see her she was not to be put aside. "All right," she said, "I'll stay and see the doctor for me warts."

The parents' failure, which is driven home harder with each unsuccessful day, not only robs the children of a sense of security but often of one source of leadership. Mrs. White's bitterness toward her husband is aggravated by the fact that she is no longer able to control her 10 and 12 year old boys. They have lost all respect for their father so that he can't help her. Then, too, she has had to take her oldest boy out of school.

In considering to-day's unemployment, it is not often thought of in its relation to the next generation. But as you come to know the families of the unemployed it sometimes seems that they feel a deeper resentment against their inability to make plans for the future than they do against their immediate sufferings. We can understand how the Bendiks thought of themselves as at the bottom of the ladder, and, after 12 years, worse off than when they started out—with their savings gone, bills piled up, and uncertainty ahead of their three children. Mrs. Carter, of Columbus, Ga., sums up for us the feeling which runs like an unsteady ray of hope through so many of our family histories: "When you don't have much yourself you like to see your children get it. We have planned all our lives to have our children have a high-school education. Yes; maybe you are right; perhaps we will be able to give it to the little ones, but you know how it is with a mother, she don't want none of them slighted."

To the physical misery and strain is added the broken morale, the wreckage of human relations and hopes for boys and girls. We are perhaps not so quick to feel badly about people being worried as about their being hungry. But to the families concerned the effects on the spirit may be more devastating. They tell us so many times, "It's not the going without we mind; it's the insecurity." The man who has lost his sense of belongingness with the loss of his job, and with it his place in the scheme of his own household, is on new and unsteady footing. Under the emotional upset of fathers and mothers is the sense of trying to build on quicksand. Most of us like to feel that in living we are building and the glimpses we catch of this trait, persisting in the face of circumstances, is one of the things that in reading these stories reassures us as to the reserves of human nature. The older folk have a patience that puts us to shame; but they lack the tools and materials to build with anew. The younger married men and women who lose their start have youth on their side but at the same time are goaded with youth's impatience at futility.

What, above all, unemployment does to people is to take the spring out of them.

#### SECURITY

If these stories, as we believe, are fair cross sections of experience, then unemployment strikes in two ways at the security of the wage-earning family.

First, the workman can not be sure of holding his job. Through all the cases runs the evidence that perseverance, skill, education, health, long and excellent work records—none of these "stand the breadwinner in certain stead when the bad word is handed down."

Second, the workman's family has no surety in tiding over the time he is out of work. Our analyses of the lines on which our families fell back in their trouble showed that neither savings in cash, nor homes, nor furniture, nor personal keepsakes; neither charity nor getting into debt to butcher and baker; neither moving to cheaper quarters nor scrimping on food, nor the enforced labor of mothers and children gave adequate assurance of livelihood when broken work or no work at all drove these families back on their own resources. All combined, these makeshifts did not offer a reasonable solution of their predicament nor one which we should tolerate as part of our going life.

Those of us who have gathered and analyzed and interpreted these stories found agreement in the following propositions:<sup>1</sup>

"Clearly whether unemployment is controllable or uncontrollable its ultimate burden falls upon men least able to bear it and frequently upon those in no way responsible for its incidence. Most of the great modern nations have provided their workers with some form of insurance against such unemployment. We have not.

"A small group of progressive American employers have set up employment reserves, and in the garment trades we have had an outstanding example of a mutual fund under labor-management control. The United States has built up better employment statistics by industries than has Europe. It is held by certain economists that an original scheme of protective insurance classified by trades and establishments can be devised so that, as in our fire-insurance companies, the economic pressure of the system will give an advantage to those industries which regularize their employment. But whether protection is arranged by individual management, by the trade as a whole, or through public action, as in compensation laws, the burden of unemployment should not be allowed to fall solely on the family of the worker."

The ills that flesh is heir to will always contribute to the total of unemployment. Sickness, bad habits, insanity, irresponsibility, incapacity, accidents, old age, and death put families on the rocks. But these are problems of health and psychiatry, of relief and other spheres of social treatment. Our settlement study sought to disentangle the unemployed from the unemployable by focusing on families whose predicament is due to industrial causes outside their control.

Under any scheme of protection which would make industry and the consuming public copartners in insuring against the risk of broken work which thus confronts them, the benefits would cover only a comparatively small share of the loss from broken earnings. The greater share would continue to be borne by the families and the dislodged wage earners themselves. If these case stories show anything, they show that most families can be counted upon to shoulder that share with fortitude. But the insurance benefits would create a minimum provision against the more extreme forms of distress. Their receipt would come not as an affront to the instinct for self-dependence but as part of the bargain of livelihood for those whose fortunes are bound up in the operation of American industry.

We should not leave it to people so disadvantaged to combat, single-handed, the industrial changes and dislocations which tear at the structure of their homes.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House insisted on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14246) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes; agreed to the con-

ference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WOOD, Mr. THATCHER, Mr. HARDY, Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania, Mr. BYRNS, and Mr. ARNOLD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 2865) granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of Wyoming and Idaho with respect to the boundary line between said States.

The message further announced that the House had passed bills of the following titles, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 7254. An act to amend an act entitled "An act making an appropriation for the survey of public lands lying within the limits of land grants, to provide for the forfeiture to the United States of unsurveyed land grants to railroads, and for other purposes" approved June 25, 1910;

H. R. 8534. An act for the transfer of jurisdiction over Sullys Hill National Park from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture, to be maintained as the Sullys Hill National Game Preserve, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12404. An act to amend the act of April 9, 1924, so as to provide for national-park approaches;

H. R. 12697. An act to authorize an exchange of lands between the United States and the State of Utah;

H. R. 13547. An act to safeguard the validity of permits to use recreational areas in the San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests; and

H. R. 15008. An act to extend the south and east boundaries of the Mount Rainier National Park, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes.

#### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 447) making an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the public resolution entitled "Joint resolution for the relief of farmers in the drought and/or storm stricken areas of the United States," approved December 20, 1930, and it was signed by the Vice President.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

Messages from the President of the United States making nominations were referred to the appropriate committees.

#### MODERNIZATION OF BATTLESHIPS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The special order, Senate bill 4750, is before the Senate, and will be proceeded with.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4750) to authorize alterations and repairs to certain naval vessels.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, under a special order, agreed to by unanimous consent on January 6, Senate bill 4750, to authorize alterations and repairs in certain naval vessels, is before the Senate for consideration this morning, a motion having been made to reconsider the vote by which that measure was passed.

The bill was introduced June 24, 1930, by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED]. It was reported from the committee early in the present session by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], and he asked unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the measure. There was no objection. The request for its consideration was made soon after convening, when very few Senators were on the floor, and some who were here did not know what measure was under consideration.

A similar bill was also introduced in the House of Representatives, and was considered by the House Committee on Naval Affairs. In the latter part of last June the bill was reported from that committee and went on the House calendar at the last session of Congress, but with the understanding, I am told, that a vote would not be taken upon the bill until the present session of Congress which met last month, for the reason, it was said, that it would take a two-thirds majority of the House to provide for a special rule for consideration of that particular bill during the last

<sup>1</sup>Page 161, conclusion; Some Folks Won't Work, by Clinch Calkins, Harcourt, Brace & Co.

session, and the proponents of the bill in that body were afraid they did not have the two-thirds majority.

In the discussion a few days ago the Senator from Virginia made the statement several times that there never had been any real opposition to the repair of these old battleships. The Senator from Virginia was mistaken in that statement, especially in regard to the situation in the House of Representatives. Such measures have been objected to strenuously in the House for several years. They have also been objected to at times in the Senate.

As I have stated, this bill was reported by the Senator from Virginia. When the Secretary of the Navy was before the House committee last June he said that one of the battleships would be repaired at the Norfolk Navy Yard and one would be repaired at the Philadelphia Navy Yard; and, accordingly, it has been suggested that this is a relief bill for the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] and the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]. The Senator from Virginia made the statement that the passage of the bill would result in putting many men to work. The chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate made the statement that it would take about 2,400 men to modernize these battleships. The Senator from Virginia said that it would take about five or six thousand men to do the work. The Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Adams, stated that it would take three or four thousand men.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. FRAZIER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I think the discrepancy in the figures as stated by the Senator from North Dakota arises from this condition: The men who will actually work on these ships comprise about 2,400; but in connection with the work that is to be done a great deal of additional work will have to be done in other plants in the country; so that, in all, the modernization program will probably give employment to substantially from 4,000 to 4,500 men. When I stated the number at 2,400 I was speaking of the men who would be directly employed on work on the ships.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, that may be correct; at any rate, those were the statements made by several gentlemen who are in favor of the passage of this measure. I am willing to take a happy medium between the figures as suggested and say that 5,000 men would be given employment by the modernization of these old battleships. The expenditure of \$30,000,000 for 5,000 men would be \$6,000 per man. It has been stated authoritatively, I think, that we have at least 5,000,000 unemployed men in the United States to-day. At that rate, it would take 6,000 times \$5,000,000, or \$30,000,000,000 to provide employment for the 5,000,000 who are out of employment to-day, under the suggested provisions of this measure.

Mr. President, last year the United States Navy spent \$375,291,828.11. That was during the fiscal year of 1930. That is more than a million dollars per day; it is more than \$700 each minute, day and night, during the year 1930 spent by the United States Navy—\$700 per minute for the year.

That is more than the average farmer—yes; it is twice as much as the average farmer—in the United States last year made in net profit for his year's work; twice as much each minute was spent for United States Navy in peace times as the average farmer in the United States who produced the food products to feed the Navy and everyone else made for his year's work last year. Of course, the War Department spent more than the Navy did. There was over \$1,400 spent each minute, day and night, by the Army and Navy last year.

Mr. President, that is the largest amount ever spent in peace times in the history of the United States for the Navy and for the Army. It is the largest amount ever spent by any nation on the face of the earth in peace times for its army and navy, and that, too, Mr. President, in the face of the fact that our Nation was instrumental in having adopted the Kellogg peace pact. We succeeded in getting

53 nations to sign that pact, which was entitled "A treaty for the renunciation of war." Yet in the face of the fact that we succeeded in getting 53 nations to sign the Kellogg peace pact for the renunciation of war, last year we appropriated and spent more money than any other nation on the face of the earth ever spent in peace times upon an army and navy.

Then we have had disarmament conferences, so called. It will be remembered that one was held in Washington back in 1923, and last year the London Naval Disarmament Conference was held. Yet it is proposed to-day to provide a still larger appropriation for the Army and Navy than we had last year, although we ratified the treaty growing out of the London Disarmament Conference last year to reduce naval armaments, and, of course, we did scrap three old battleships last year. Those old battleships had already been modernized, as it is called, but they were scrapped at a loss of over \$11,000,000. To modernize those three old battleships which were sunk it cost something over \$11,000,000, but they have been scrapped and now we want to modernize three more.

I read carefully the statement of the Secretary of the Navy and other officials and officers of the Navy Department who appeared before the House Committee on Naval Affairs last June in favor of this bill. The principal argument of the Secretary of the Navy was that if we would spend \$30,000,000 for the modernization of these three antiquated battleships we would then be on a parity with the Navy of Great Britain, at least as to battleships. The word "parity" has been overworked during the past few years in connection with the Navy as well as in other connections. We heard something about a parity, it will be remembered, during the time we were discussing the farm relief bill here and also when we were discussing the tariff bill; in fact, there was an understanding in both great political parties during the campaign in 1928 that farming should be put on a parity with other businesses and industries, but the parity that the farmer has received is nothing like the parity that our Navy is asking for in order that it may be put on an equal basis with the navy of Great Britain.

It seems to me that the most childish argument that could be advanced by the head of our Navy Department for the expenditure of \$30,000,000 of the money of the taxpayers of the United States at this time is that it would put our Navy on a parity with that of Great Britain.

Mr. President, it is like the little boy who at Christmas time receives a toy from Santa Claus or some one else and is very much pleased with it until he finds out that the little boy across the street got two or three toys more than he did and perhaps they cost a little more money. He is very much worried about it and feels very badly and goes to his mamma and complains because he did not get as many toys as his little neighbor across the street received. So, because we have not as many battleships or they are not as modern as the battleships of Great Britain, the Secretary of the Navy comes before Congress and asks for an appropriation of \$30,000,000 to modernize three old battleships, and he places that item at the head of his naval program for the ensuing year. It seems that in the estimation of the Navy Department the most important thing before the Congress at this time, so far as the Navy is concerned, is the modernization of these three old battleships. They are only 12 years old, and a battleship is supposed to be good for 20 years at least. The Navy Department wants to put in new boilers and new engines and new everything else in them, although they admit that the boilers are good for the remainder of the 20 years. They are asking to spend from a half to two or three times as much as we have spent for the modernization of other battleships.

As one of the methods of modernization, the elevation of the guns is suggested so that the guns can shoot a mile and a half or such a matter farther than the old guns can shoot. That would be a great benefit undoubtedly. They also want to put blisters on the battleships. The Senator from Virginia did not seem to understand very well what blisters were or could not explain the term very well the

other day, and so I looked it up. The blister, or the "bulge" as it is called, is a steel plate running the whole length of the battleship on the outside and bulging out about 6 feet from the side of the ship. It covers the armored part of the battleship on each side. It is called a "bulge" or a "blister" and is placed on the ship to afford protection against torpedo attack.

Mr. President, it seems mighty strange that apparently it is impossible for the leading officials and officers of the United States Navy to think of anything new. They base their argument and their pleas for greater expenditures of money only upon past experience. During the World War, it will be recalled, many battleships and other vessels were sunk by torpedoes fired by German U-boats. Up and down our Atlantic coast in the summer of 1918 there were eighty some ships of one kind or another sunk by German U-boats in just a few months. So the Navy has got to protect its ships against torpedoes, and the officers of the Navy say that the little blister which I have described on the side of the battleship will protect them because it will cause the torpedo to explode a little farther away, 6 feet farther away, from the vitals of the ship.

Mr. President, I talked with an old sailor a few days ago about this. He said, "Why all that any enemy would have to do, or anyone else, to overcome that so-called 'blister'—that 6 feet of additional space on the outside of the battleship—would be to make the torpedo a little larger, a little heavier, and put a little more explosive in it; and," he said, "it would go clear through the battleship if necessary." Then, of course, because they have elevated the guns a little bit to shoot a mile or so farther, and give the projectiles a high range which might enable them to strike on the deck of a battleship, they want to cover the deck of the battleship with heavier armor to protect it against the shells that are to be fired from long range by these elevated guns.

How about the bombs to be dropped from bombing planes? Will the little armor on the top of the deck protect the battleship? The Secretary of the Navy, in the hearing before the House committee, stated several times—I think they made him say it three or four times—that in his opinion there was little danger from airplanes to modern battleships; that is, if they are modernized, of course.

Mr. McCLINTIC, a member of the committee from Oklahoma, said:

Do you hold to the theory that a bombing plane can not destroy a battleship?

Secretary ADAMS. Substantially so. It is a somewhat remote danger. There is always danger of some sort from every instrumentality in war.

Different members of the committee made him repeat similar statements several times. Of course, he does not agree with many authorities along that line.

On January 9 Congressman FREAR, of Wisconsin, spoke at some length on the disarmament question. Among other things, on page 1798 of the RECORD he quotes a statement from Rear Admiral William A. Moffett, chief of naval aeronautics, under a Miami headline of January 8:

Speaking at the dedication of the new naval reserve aviation base, Admiral Moffett declared:

"I consider it our national duty to build up to the treaty strength allowed."

Of course he is for the air proposition.

Failure to do so can result in but one thing—a world-wide admission that we have relinquished our hard-won right to be regarded as a first power and are lacking in the spirit to take our rightful place as a nation in world affairs.

He goes on:

The last reported achievement of science is the strataplane, scheduled to travel 500 miles an hour at an elevation, if needed, of 40,000 feet. Add to this achievement new high explosives of unprecedented destructive power and poison gasses of threefold deadly potency and yet there remain "preparedness" officials perpetually prating of security.

He goes on:

Security is to be achieved only by adding armament to armament—frontier forts and floating fortresses.

Then he quotes from the recent sham invasion of London some months ago. The writer speaks of the impossibility of finding security anywhere. In that invasion, he says:

Seventy-five planes invaded London from the north. London, forewarned, was defended by an equal number of planes plus anti-air guns and balloons. In spite of all these preparations the invaders dropped 200 bombs (duds) over selected targets and retired without losing a single plane. Evidently "preparedness" furnishes no "security."

I have another statement in regard to the same airplane maneuvers over London. It is a report of the Air Ministry of London. This was their conclusion after they had had several days of those experimental bombings. It says:

London is too big to be adequately protected. In another war its vital parts would soon be in ruins and the rest made uninhabitable by gas.

The admiral does not say much there about striking battleships, but, of course, there is no question but that battleships can be struck.

I have here a book entitled "Winged Defense," by Col. William Mitchell. You remember well Colonel Mitchell's statements in regard to the sinking of battleships by bombing planes. I think I can best express it by quoting from an editorial of Arthur Brisbane's in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of October 6, 1929. He gives some pictures here of the bombing experiments. Those were pictures taken during the experiments when several battleships were sunk by bombing planes under the direction of Col. William Mitchell. I want to read a little from this editorial:

It will interest you to read General Mitchell's book, *Winged Defense*, recently published, and his description of actual airplane attack on floating vessels.

That is the book I have here. I am not going to read it all this afternoon, however.

First, in such attack would come the frightfully swift planes, such as now do 250 miles and even more an hour. These planes, safe from anti-aircraft guns, flying above the battleships high in the air, more swiftly than a swallow, would drop light bombs, as General Mitchell explains it, "to clear the decks of any exposed personnel, smash up the communicating and radio systems, and probably bend the battleships propeller shafts and rudders, so that even a heavily armored vessel could not be worked after an attack with these light bombs."

Then he quotes, a little later on, from this report of Colonel Mitchell:

The German fighting ship *Ostfriesland*, by order of Congress, was used for airplane bombing experiments, General Mitchell flying with the bombing planes and directing the work. In his book he gives all credit to the flying officers under his command.

He thus describes vividly the "death" of the great fighting ship *Ostfriesland*, attacked from the air:

This is a quotation from Mitchell:

On the fourth shot Captain Streett, sitting in the back seat of my plane, stood up, and, waving both arms, shouted, "She is gone!"

When a death blow has been dealt by a bomb to a vessel, there is no mistaking it. Water can be seen to come up under both sides of the ship, she trembles all over, as if her nerve center had been shattered, and she usually rises in the water, sometimes clear, with her bow or stern.

In a minute the *Ostfriesland* was on her side; in two minutes she was sliding down by the stern and turning over at the same time; in three minutes she was bottom side up, looking like a gigantic whale, the water oozing out of her seams as she prepared to go down to the bottom, then gradually she went down stern first.

In a minute more only the tip of her beak showed above the water. It looked as if her stern had touched the bottom of the sea as she stood there straight up in a hundred fathoms of water to bid a last farewell to all her sister battleships around her.

This editorial goes on:

The German ship, the *Ostfriesland*, please remember, had gone through the great Battle of Jutland, against the British fleet, and bore the scars of battle.

A few inexpensive airplanes did to the fighting ship and its heavy armor what the great battleships of England could not do.

Of the destruction of this great ship General Mitchell writes: "It was a very serious and awesome sight. Some of the spectators on the observing vessels wept, so overwrought were their feelings."

The ship was sunk with bombs, of which none weighed more than 2,000 pounds.

What would happen to any battleship if one of the modern heavy-bombing planes dropped a 3 or 4 ton bomb upon it?

What would happen to a fleet of battleships attacked by a fleet of airships like the *Dornier X*, just built in Germany, to carry

100 passengers and a crew, an all-metal plane, with 3 decks, 12 engines?

The effect of little bombs used in our experiments, while skeptical Navy officers looked on, is made clear in General Mitchell's description of the destruction by airplane of the German cruiser *Frankfurt*. He writes:

"Many amusing things occurred. At the first direct hit of a bomb on the *Frankfurt's* deck, fragments of steel were thrown over the water for over a mile. The crews of the observing battleships had crowded to the rails to watch, but as these pieces of steel came nearer and nearer to them, they rushed to the other side of the vessel for protection. It made one think what might happen in case a real attack was made against naval vessels in war, whether the crews could be held to their posts, in view of almost certain destruction."

It is not necessary, in the destruction of a ship, that a bomb should actually strike it. Let it strike the water reasonably close to the ship and the destruction is as great. For water, incompressible, acts as a battering ram and carries to the side of the ship, below the water line, the full exploding force of the bomb as it strikes against the water.

One of the American ships watching the airplane bombing experiments, at what was thought a safe distance, had its condenser put out of commission by concussion through the water, and was obliged "to limp into port at 3 miles an hour."

To continue:

The battleship is gone. The fast cruisers we must have, at least as many of them as any nation on earth—

That is Mr. Brisbane's opinion—

as long as they continue to be of use as a menace to the commercial shipping of an enemy.

Then he continues:

Some may say: "The airship will be terrible at sea; but we are interested in what happens on land."

They are even more interested in the airplane than are the sailors.

On water the ship seems a small target and it can be moved. The crowded city is big and can not move.

Everything an airplane can do at sea it can do on land, with more deadly effect.

A fleet of airplanes within an hour can wipe out all the important buildings in Washington, including the Capitol, White House, and Treasury.

It could reduce to ruins the great buildings and bridges of New York or any other city.

And, worse, aerial warfare, supplemented by chemical warfare, could literally destroy the lives of human beings by the hundreds of thousands, and even by millions, driving survivors in desperation from gas-filled streets into the country.

This means that a bomb of poison gas, instantly spreading, dropped in the center of Wall Street financial district, taking Trinity Church spire as a target, could kill 90 per cent of the important financiers in the United States.

The killing off of a few in Wall Street does not worry me so much. But undoubtedly, in case of another world war, these bombings would take place over every great city in the country that was being attacked.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator surely would want to save some of the people who live in New York? The Senator would not want everybody in New York killed, would he?

Mr. FRAZIER. Oh, no. I said that probably the killing of a few in Wall Street would not make any great difference. Of course, I know a lot of people would not agree with me in that.

Mr. COPELAND. Would the Senator arrange so that I could select those to be killed off?

Mr. FRAZIER. The Senator from New York undoubtedly would have some influence in a case of that kind.

Mr. COPELAND. I would not think I would have in the case specified by the Senator; but if he is going to have some killed in New York, will he not arrange so that I may select them?

Mr. FRAZIER. I admit I may be a little prejudiced against Wall Street manipulations and some of the people who manipulate things up there. A couple of years ago I was visiting the city of New York; and having a letter of introduction to a former president of the chamber of commerce of that great city, I called on him. He was a very

genial sort of fellow; he invited me to lunch. We went over to the Chamber of Commerce Building and had lunch there, and during the lunch we got to talking about the political situation. This New York gentleman said, "The trouble with you fellows from the West is that you will not admit that right here in Wall Street we have the finances of this great Nation, and you people have to come here for money if you want it." I said, "You may be right in your statement, but we are not going to admit it, and we are going to keep fighting just as long as we can against that kind of manipulation of the credit of our great Nation." So perhaps I am a little prejudiced against the great metropolis.

Those bombing experiences over London, over Paris, and there were some over the city of New York, too, all proved that in the event of another world war it would be practically impossible, and the experts admitted it, to keep bombing planes from coming in. One or two bombing planes would carry enough explosives to annihilate any of our great cities.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation in regard to the Senator's remarks about the value of the battleship, the vulnerability of battleships from attacks from the air, or the lack of it?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. ODDIE. I wish the Senator could have seen a demonstration I saw several years ago about a hundred miles off the Virginia Capes, when the former German battleship *Ostfriesland* was sunk by bombs from the air. Much of the best aviation talent of the United States was used in the sinking of that ship. Some of the best aviators in the world and the most up-to-date aviation equipment and bombs were used. Yet it took nearly a day and a half to sink the ship. She was anchored a hundred miles offshore, with not a man on board, not an antiaircraft gun in use. Several squadrons of seven or eight planes each came from the shore and the first afternoon dropped quite a number of 250-pound bombs. Some of them struck the ship and others struck the water close to it, but they had practically no effect on the ship. They kept bombing her part of the afternoon with 250-pound bombs. Then squadrons of planes were brought out with 500-pound bombs, with the same result. The upper works of the ship was naturally battered up pretty badly, but no material damage was done. I do not know how many bombs struck the ship and struck the water near the ship. I observed the demonstration from a distance of about half a mile. The next day numbers of planes came out with 1,000-pound bombs, and after they had been dropped on and in the water near the ship she still floated. She was badly battered, but not until 2,000-pound bombs were brought, about eight of them, and dropped on and about the ship, did she sink.

Mr. President, I contend that a bomb dropped from the air will not necessarily sink a battleship. I think there must have been nearly a hundred bombs dropped on and around that ship before she finally went down, and under the most favorable conditions for the aviators, because the ship was anchored and the aviators knew just where she was. There was not a man on board and not an antiaircraft gun in operation. I have the highest regard and respect for our naval and Army aviators, and I have a pretty good idea of the splendid work they could do in case of war in protecting our country and in carrying on offensives from the air; but the battleship is not obsolete. It is a necessary factor in carrying out our system of national defense.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. ODDIE. Certainly.

Mr. REED. How thick was the deck armor of the *Ostfriesland*?

Mr. ODDIE. The *Ostfriesland* was one of the most modern German battleships. It was captured after the war.

Mr. REED. It is true, is it not, that her deck armor was something less than 3 inches thick?

Mr. ODDIE. I do not know; but I presume that her deck armor was not as thick as that on our battleships after they are modernized.

Mr. REED. A part of the purpose of this bill is to enable the Navy to thicken the deck armor of these three battleships so as to protect them against bombing attacks?

Mr. ODDIE. That is part of the purpose, and the other is to enable the Navy to put blisters on the hulls of these ships to protect them and Americans on those ships from torpedo attacks. As good Americans we can not afford to subject our own people to a serious danger which can be prevented by the passing of this bill.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada is a little mixed in his statement. He must remember that the demonstration with the *Ostfriesland* was only an experiment. Colonel Mitchell stated in his report that he wanted to go out with 2,000-pound bombs in the first place and sink the ship at once, but the other authorities said, "No; we want to experiment. We want to drop some small bombs and see what the effect will be on the old battleship." So they started in with light bombs, and Mitchell says that apparently one of them struck on the deck and would no doubt have killed any living human being on the deck, and probably would have wrecked the machinery and blown up the ship if it had been loaded with munitions, as a battleship in action would have been.

After the first day's bombing, I think it was, the ship was damaged to such an extent that it listed over on one side, and they had to go out the next morning and let in tons of water on the upper side to balance it so that they could go on with their practice the next day. Then, when they came with the 2,000-pound bombs, only four of them were dropped, and I think none struck the battleship. The decks might have been 6 feet thick, or 10 feet thick, but the bottom of the vessel was stoven-in by the concussion of the bombs that struck near the battleship.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, in that connection I am sure that one of the bombs struck the deck.

Mr. FRAZIER. Some of the first ones dropped did.

Mr. ODDIE. One tribute to American aviation was that as that ship was sinking by the stern, when the bow of the ship was slowly disappearing and only about 6 feet of it was above the water, the last bomb hit that ship right on the bow (literally in the nose), one of the most wonderful demonstrations of the accuracy of our aviators that could have been demonstrated.

One other comment. The ship was anchored. The aviators knew exactly where it was. They could set their course when they left the land, knowing they would find the ship, and the visibility was good. In case of battle conditions the visibility might be bad, and we could not afford to send a plane carrying a 2,000-pound bomb on a wild mission to try to find a battleship somewhere at sea without knowing where it was, because before it could be found the plane might be lost and destroyed and the aviators' lives lost.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, can the Senator tell us how high these bombing planes flew at the time of their attack?

Mr. ODDIE. Something under 3,000 feet, I believe.

Mr. REED. Can the Senator tell us what their orders were as to the height they were to maintain?

Mr. ODDIE. I can not say as to that. I presume they were following out the orders which had been given them, but I know they did remarkably accurate work.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator think that a bombing plane would approach a battleship at an altitude of 3,000 feet now?

Mr. ODDIE. No; it could not do so now, with our modern antiaircraft guns, tremendously improved over what they were in the war time, without being subjected to extreme danger.

Mr. FRAZIER. I just read from the report of Admiral Moffet that the most up-to-date plane could attain a height of 40,000 feet if necessary.

Mr. REED. The Senator does not mean they could hit anything from that height, does he?

Mr. FRAZIER. Perhaps not so accurately as they could closer down, of course, but they can carry a lot of bombs, a great many more than they could five or six years ago, when these experiments were undertaken. It is true that the

antiaircraft guns have been improved a great deal in that time, too; but I think the Senator will admit that no anti-aircraft gun or any other kind of a gun will reach anything like 40,000 feet.

General Mitchell concluded with this sentence:

It conclusively proved the ability of aircraft to destroy ships of all classes on the surface of the water.

He says that after they had sunk the *Ostfriesland* and several smaller craft their experiments were called off by the Navy, because, he says, it seemed that the heads of the Navy were afraid they would demonstrate that there was absolutely no excuse for building battleships under present conditions, so the experiment was called off by the Navy.

Mr. President, here is a quotation I was looking for, an editorial in the Brisbane column of the Washington Herald of January 11, 1931:

The next war will not be pleasant. Submarines will prowl, like invisible sharks, destroying all merchantmen. Airplanes will sink any fighting vessels that dare to leave port. With poison gas, explosive bombs, and fire bombs, they will drive population from the cities, destroying millions.

That is Mr. Brisbane's opinion, and I think he is generally conceded to be pretty well posted and to have pretty good ideas on most everything about which he writes.

The experience during the World War demonstrated, I believe that the navies of all the countries that were engaged in that great war were afraid of bombing planes, and a lot of our fighting vessels were up the Hudson River during a great part of the war. An authority on naval matters made the statement before a House committee some months ago that in the event of another world war the safest place for the battleships would be as far up the Mississippi River as they could get.

Mr. KING. Admiral Sims made that statement.

Mr. FRAZIER. Yes; it was Admiral Sims. I think it is generally admitted that that would be the condition in the event of another world war. Representative FREAR, of Wisconsin, mentioned what I believe to be the fact in a statement on the floor of the House on the 9th of this month, that they have a covering for the battleships after they get them in the river to try to protect them from bombs, a covering made of steel cables woven together and put right over the top of the battleships to try to keep the bombs off the battleships.

Mr. President, only yesterday the Naval Affairs Committee of the House reported out a bill, so the papers this morning say, for the appropriation of \$74,000,000 for the building of airplanes, torpedo boats, and airplane carriers, evidently for the purpose of protecting these old, antiquated battleships, to modernize which we are asked to appropriate \$30,000,000.

If they can not have that protection undoubtedly they can be sunk in less time than it takes to tell it by great bombs from the air. So they want \$30,000,000 first; that is the first thing in the naval program for this session to modernize these old battleships. Then the next thing that has been reported out by the committee in the House is an appropriation bill carrying \$74,000,000 to protect the old battleships, to protect the \$30,000,000 we are asked to put into these antiquated battleships.

Mr. President, we have been haggling for days here over a little appropriation of \$15,000,000 for the relief of the drought-stricken farmers of this country, to keep the farmers and their families from starving to death, and yet we are asked now to authorize an appropriation for the modernization of old and antiquated battleships—and for what purpose? To give these tinselled officers of the Navy better floating palaces so they can promenade the decks with their ladies and their friends and have a modernized battleship for that purpose. It is going to cost \$10,000,000 apiece to modernize these battleships in these hard times when the President in his message said we must use every effort to keep down expenses.

O Mr. President, I can not see how any Member of this body can conscientiously vote to authorize the appropriation

of \$30,000,000 at this time when we need that money to save human lives, when we need that money to save starving people who have worked all their lifetimes in the farming game and who because of the drought last season are now on the rocks. We need that money to protect them and to give employment to the unemployed.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. DILL. Even if these ships are modernized how long will it be before they are scrapped?

Mr. FRAZIER. The life of a modernized battleship is about 12 to 15 years, I think.

Mr. DILL. I referred to the ships in question, which are to be modernized if we pass this bill.

Mr. FRAZIER. I think when the next disarmament conference comes along undoubtedly they will all be scrapped.

Mr. DILL. Is it not a fact that they will be scrapped in five or six years?

Mr. FRAZIER. I think, undoubtedly, it will happen in less time than that.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. REED. These ships will be seaworthy for another 30 years. They will be in service for at least another 20 years. Nobody can say in advance what the exact life of their service will be.

Mr. DILL. The Senator knows they will not be in service for another 20 years.

Mr. REED. I know nothing of the kind. I believe to the contrary.

Mr. FRAZIER. The life of a battleship is only about 20 years in the first place.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. KING. If these battleships will have a prolongation of life so they can serve 30 years more, I ask the Senator why the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] and his able colleagues did not accept the proposition tentatively made by the British representatives, if not by others, in that conference that the life of a battleship be extended from the present limitation to 25 years? My recollection is that the Senator from Pennsylvania and his colleagues refused to take up the consideration of that question, as well as other important questions, such as taking steps toward the abolition of the battleship.

Mr. REED. I had better answer that later.

Mr. FRAZIER. Yes; that will be hard to answer.

Mr. REED. No; it will not be in the least hard to answer. It may be because my manners are somewhat different that I do not interrupt the Senator from North Dakota at great length.

Mr. FRAZIER. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy, although I am willing to yield if the Senator wants to take the time to answer now.

Mr. President, the majority of the Parliament of England have gone on record several times, according to the best information I can get, that battleships are at least antiquated at the present time; that they would not be much protection, comparatively speaking, in the event of another world war. Of course, the Secretary of the Navy told the Committee on Naval Affairs over in the House that the British Admiralty is strongly in favor of battleships. Our Navy is in favor of battleships. Any officer of any navy any place in the world would be in favor of battleships. If he is in command of one of these great floating palaces, costing anywhere from \$15,000,000 to \$40,000,000, of course he would be in favor of a navy. The modern battleship is literally a floating palace. Of course they are in favor of them, and they are not going to give them up until they have to do so, because, as I said, they always seem to proceed on the theory

of what has happened in the past. They do not seem to be able to look into the future at all. They think because battleships have been the front line of defense in our fighting in the past they are going to continue to be in the future. But, Mr. President, times change; and according to experts—and I shall read some more from them before I get through—these battleships will be of mighty little protection in the event of another world war.

I want to read from a letter from the Secretary of the Navy written when he advocated the passage of this bill. This is from the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate. The letter is addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. The one I hold in my hand now gives the different amounts of the improvements that they want to make, amounting, according to the itemized statement, to \$29,793,750. They ask for \$30,000,000. Of course, they have a standing rule or law, or some regulation—I do not know just what it is—that they can spend \$300,000 on an old battleship to repair it without any authorization from Congress, so they are asking for a mere bagatelle of \$202,800 more than they think will be needed, in view of the fact that they also have \$900,000 which they can spend on the three of them without any special authorization from Congress if needed. Of course, a little thing like \$1,100,000 does not amount to much with the Navy, where they spend hundreds of millions of dollars each year of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I do not want you to forget the fact that after all the money spent on these battleships is raised from the taxpayers out "in the sticks." Oh, yes; the bulk of that money may come from the great income-tax payers, but that wealth is created by the people who work out "in the sticks" and not by the men who sit in their swivel chairs in Wall Street.

I want to read this letter from the Secretary of the Navy, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,  
Washington, December 4, 1930.

HON. FREDERICK HALE,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Referring to Senate bill No. 4750, it has been the accepted policy of the Navy to modernize its battleship fleet by such changes as are necessary to permit a greater elevation of the guns on each ship permitting the increase of range required by expected battle conditions, together with protective decks adequate to meet long-range fire, and blisters sufficient to provide the necessary displacement to carry these changes and also to provide protection against submarine attack.

We ask for the authorization of three ships because they are the only ships remaining without necessary gun elevation. For that and other reasons they should be treated as a class and authorized together in order that the Navy may have a guide as to its future policy.

We ask for appropriations sufficient to cover the modernization of the *Mississippi* and *Idaho* only. We do not desire appropriation for the third ship, because we do not regard it as good policy to withdraw as many as three ships for a long period from the fighting line, as it would hopelessly cripple our fleet in the eventuality of war.

Mr. President, I had not known since the armistice was signed that we had any "fighting line." It would endanger the safety of this great Nation of ours to withdraw three of these old antiquated battleships from the "fighting line" at the present time, so the Secretary of the Navy has asked for funds to modernize two at a time, letting the third one wait until the first two can get back into the "fighting line." The letter continues:

Moreover, with the withdrawal of three ships now, in addition to the ships already in our navy yards for modernization and the ships for other reasons not available for maneuvers we would be left with an operating force entirely too small for regular and necessary maneuvers and training. We would find it impossible to adequately employ or train our officers and seamen.

Mr. President, if the three battleships were taken out of the "fighting line" at the same time, we would not have enough battleships to put on the proper maneuvers to uphold the dignity of this great Nation of ours, the wealthiest in the world. Of course, we should have the greatest line of battleships of any nation, because we are the wealthiest in the world. That is a fine argument for a larger navy!

The other day in discussing this proposition the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] made the statement that it is necessary to pass the bill at once in order to give work to 3,000, 4,000, or 5,000 men. The fact is that the work on the ships which are being repaired at the present time, according to the estimate of the Navy Department, will not be completed until the 1st of March next; but, of course, they want the authorization so they can get the other ships ready for modernization by the time the first battleships are out of the way.

I do not think the statement was made intentionally, but from the statements of both of those Senators one would think these workmen are actually out of employment at the present time. That is not the case. They are being employed at the present time in the modernization of some of the old battleships which are being repaired now.

In the modernization of the old battleships which have been repaired in the past they have not spent nearly as much money as they ask for the three involved in the present bill. Although the price of materials has gone down and the price of labor, I think, has not increased, yet they are asking for more money. The first battleships on which similar alterations took place were the *Florida*, *Utah*, *Wyoming*, *Arkansas*, *New York*, and *Texas*. There was \$19,000,000 expended for six of them, a little over \$3,000,000 apiece. Then afterwards the *Oklahoma* and *Nevada* were modernized at a cost of \$13,600,000, or \$6,800,000 apiece. Then the *Pennsylvania* and *Arizona* were modernized at a total cost of \$14,800,000, or \$7,400,000 apiece. But now the *New Mexico*, *Mississippi*, and *Idaho* are to be modernized at a cost of \$10,000,000 apiece. I do not know, and it has not been explained anywhere that I could find, why they are asking the additional amount. Perhaps they are making more repairs on them than they have on the others. At least, they are asking for more money.

The three battleships which were scrapped by the recent disarmament agreement of London were the *Utah*, *Wyoming*, and *Florida*, I believe. The total cost of repairs of those three battleships was \$11,176,000, but now they are scrapped and are out of service.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator seems to hold the view that it is really not important to have any navy at all. May I call his attention to the fact that in numerical strength our Army ranks about twelfth or thirteenth among the armies of the world? The armies of Italy, of France, Japan, of Great Britain, of Poland, of Czechoslovakia—

Mr. FRAZIER. Is the Senator now talking about armies or navies?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am talking about armies—of Rumania, Russia, and of other countries, all far excel the Army of the United States in actual numbers; in fact, as I have said, we rank about twelfth in numerical strength. Let the Senator also consider the fact that 1 out of every 70 men, women, and children in France is a soldier in the active army; 1 out of every 90 in Italy is a soldier in the active army; and so it is with other foreign countries, only to a less degree; while in our country only 1 person out of every 800 is a soldier in the active Army.

Obviously, we have either got to have an army or a navy. Our country is committed to the policy of having a very small peace-time standing army. In numerical strength it is very small now by comparison with the armies of other nations. Does not the Senator feel that, inasmuch as we have such a small army, we must have for adequate self-defense a suitable Navy behind the protection of which we can train and equip and supply an army if we need it in time of war?

Before the Senator answers that question, may I point out to him that General Pershing, who is just now publishing his experiences in the World War, points out that when we went into that struggle we had 55 airplanes, of which 51 were of no value at all, and 4 were of types that did

not fit the situation; so that we had no airplanes? We had only about 225,000 rifles with which to equip our Army, and therefore had to use rifles furnished by England in order to get a sufficient number of them with which to equip our men.

May I also point out to him that we had practically no machine guns? We had four different types of such guns, but those types were inadequate. We are very much in the same situation to-day. Since the World War was fought the methods of prosecuting war have changed.

Therefore I feel that it is only fair when the Senator points out the size of our battleships and the big guns they carry and the fine ships we have that he also take into consideration the very small Army we have, and that, looking at our defense picture as a whole and comparing it with that of other nations with which we might some day contest for victory, we are not prepared for self-defense to the extent they are prepared.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland loses sight of the fact that last year we appropriated and spent more money for the United States Army by practically twice than was expended by any other country on the face of the earth.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; but battles can not be fought by appropriations made by Congress or by merely spending those appropriations. Battles are fought with artillery, machine guns, and men, and no army of 100,000 men can hope to defeat an army of a couple of million men, no matter how much money may be appropriated.

Mr. FRAZIER. When the United States Army last year was spending more than a million dollars a day the Senator from Maryland surely will not admit that that money was being thrown away or wasted?

Mr. TYDINGS. No, I will not; but does not the Senator concede that it costs more to equip a fighting man in America, with our different standard of wages, than it does to equip a fighting man in any other country which has a lower standard, and that dollar comparisons therefore are not as fair as numerical comparisons of men?

Mr. FRAZIER. It must cost a lot more, according to the amount of money we are spending.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. BROOKHART. The Senator from Maryland seems to favor enlarging the Regular Army.

Mr. TYDINGS. I did not say that at all.

Mr. BROOKHART. Well, does the Senator favor that?

Mr. TYDINGS. No, I do not; I favor the policy which our Government has followed from the time of its inception, namely, of having a navy behind which we may prepare for defense if the need should arise. I do not favor a large-sized, peace-time army; but I favor an adequate navy and a small standing army in time of peace.

Mr. BROOKHART. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that in the World War there were 20 Regular divisions, there were 17 National Guard divisions, and 17 National Army divisions organized from the grass roots. The National Army divisions and the National Guard divisions all got across—a few of them at the very end of the war—and all of them that got into active service, as nearly all of them did, made good. Of the 20 Regular divisions only 8 of them got across at all during the war.

Twelve of them remained on this side still training when the armistice was signed, and in those divisions were some of the oldest Regular regiments. I, myself, was training the Nineteenth Regular Division in marksmanship up to just a few days before the armistice, and it had in it two of the oldest Regular regiments, the Second and the Fourteenth.

I also served with the Thirty-fourth National Guard Division, which had been in training for more than a year. It had also been on the Mexican border performing service there preceding the training for the World War; it was trained stale; it ought to have been sent over months before; and yet it was down there training that Mexican border stuff,

which they never could use after they actually got into the war.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from North Dakota—

Mr. BROOKHART. So I can not see the point in the argument as to the necessity for a great Regular Army. The Regulars always fall behind the times; they will not listen to anybody like General Mitchell or even like the present head of the Air Service, General Feché. I asked General Feché one time, in the presence of the Senator from Pennsylvania, when we were talking about \$300,000,000 for cruisers, what he could do if we would give him \$300,000,000 for the Air Service. After figuring for a while, he said in three or four years he could promise us to be ready to sink all the warships in the world by the time they could get within 200 miles of our coast, including the coasts of Porto Rico, Panama, the Hawaiian Islands, and the Philippines.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Iowa has made a very clever flanking military movement. He is talking about one thing and I am talking about another.

Mr. BROOKHART. The only thing clever about it is I am taking the facts of men who know about these things.

Mr. TYDINGS. I take it for granted that the position of the Senator from North Dakota is that he is for general disarmament in the United States. Now, I take it that the Senator from Iowa, from what he has just said, is in favor of spending vast sums of money to build military airplanes; is that correct?

Mr. BROOKHART. I would spend enough; we do not need to spend half as much as General Feché estimated, because we would not have to defend ourselves against all the warships in the world.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then, the Senator from Iowa is in conflict with the Senator from North Dakota, because the Senator from North Dakota wants disarmament, while the Senator from Iowa wants many military and naval airplanes built to sink all the battleships.

Mr. BROOKHART. I am not in conflict with the Senator from North Dakota with regard to throwing \$30,000,000 into old junk that is not worth 30 cents in peace or in war after it is built.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say to the Senator from Iowa that I had a very small, modest, and inconspicuous part as a soldier on the other side during the World War, and I think the Senator ought to take into consideration in connection with the American victory in that war certain facts. First of all, he should take into consideration that it was about 14 months after we entered the war before we were able to get any equipped Army of any size onto the firing line. That we were not too late is due to the fact that our Allies were actually holding the trenches while we had time to get ready; but that condition may not prevail again.

May I also point out to the Senator, with the permission of the Senator from North Dakota, that, while we did achieve a great victory—and far be it from me to deprecate the worth of the American Army on the other side—when our major offensive did commence we met an enemy that had been worn down by four and a half years of warfare; in fact, I could cite the experience of my own division. The first day it was engaged in the Argonne offensive it took over 2,000 prisoners. I myself saw many of them surrender. They did not want to fight; they wanted to live; they were anxious to give up. What they wanted to do was to get out of the war; they were sick and tired of it.

Mr. FRAZIER. I do not blame them for that.

Mr. TYDINGS. Nor do I; but let me say to the Senator that he must not assume if in the future America should become involved in war under modern conditions that it will meet with such favorable circumstances as we met with there. We may find a virile enemy, a fresh enemy, a new enemy, one that can fight very hard; and it may not be a runaway march to victory the next time.

Mr. BROOKHART. We will have it easier the next time, because we had to cross the ocean during the World War

to get to the fighting line, but in the next war they will have to cross the ocean to get to us.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not know about that.

Mr. BROOKHART. And our defense will be a very different proposition from the offensive in which we took part in the World War. I do not think the Senator can draw any inference that I suggested the citizen soldiers did not do their duty in the World War. They won the war, so far as that is concerned. I think if the National Guard of the United States had been under its own control instead of under the General Staff control in Washington, which was always seeking for some chance to "can" every National Guard officer, whether he ought to have been "canned" or not, and make a place, particularly in the higher ranks, for some Regular officer, we would have been ready in 7 months instead of 14 months.

Furthermore, as to the rifles the Senator mentioned—

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if I may interject right there, before the Senator leaves that subject, I realize if he had been in charge of the American Army that we would have won the war within five months after we declared war upon the Central Powers. If my friend the Senator from Iowa had been general in chief of the Army of the United States, the war would not have lasted very long—

Mr. FRAZIER. I agree with the Senator as to that.

Mr. TYDINGS. Because I am sure he would have known just how that army should have been equipped and how it should have fought, and men like General Pershing and General Harbord and Newton Baker, who served with some little distinction, would all have been brushed aside and the particular plan of attack which the Senator from Iowa would have evolved at the very start would have been carried to a successful conclusion.

Mr. BROOKHART. My only experience with those big men was with Newton Baker, the civilian Secretary of War, and that was with reference to training the Army in marksmanship. Newton Baker overruled the General Staff and the managers of the Army, and if it had not been for Newton Baker, the civilian, there never would have been a training school for marksmanship and we would have gone through the war with the Army trained on the theory of the War College and the General Staff that a poor shot gets more hits in battle than a good one.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator may be talking about warfare as carried on at the target range, but let me assure him that warfare as conducted on the battlefield does not consist of shooting many bullets from rifles; that is only an incidental part of going forward and gaining ground.

Mr. BROOKHART. Still the reports growing out of the war show that the greater number of casualties were from rifle fire.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is too bad, as we look back over the long and hard war, that we did not have the expert services of my friend from Iowa, because they certainly would have been invaluable both to our Army and to the armies of our allies.

Mr. BROOKHART. Let me say that the best training General Grant ever got was when he resigned from the Army, settled on a farm, went broke, and got some common sense. [Laughter.] When officers come to the War College and plan imaginary wars and fight imaginary battles according to imaginary theories of 20 years it drains all the common sense out of them. If a man should go into a moot court and practice before imaginary judges on imaginary issues and get imaginary verdicts for 20 years, what kind of a lawyer would he be? That is what we have had to face. Every time we have been confronted with the emergency of war we have had to get rid of the old stuff. I will say to the Senator that English and French officers came to the divisions where I served and, with tears in their eyes, told me privately of the unnecessary delays incident to the Regular Army system of training the military forces of the United States. I am ready to stand up before the War College or anywhere and point out in detail how this work could have been done

better by the civilian soldiers than it was by the so-called prepared soldiers themselves.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I know that my good friend from Iowa is perfectly willing to stand up before the War College, and I have no doubt that he would be equally willing to stand up with his bosom bared to the bullets of the enemy; but may I say to the Senator that there was not enough training for the American soldiers who went abroad. I went abroad with one of the so-called fine National Guard divisions of which he speaks, and served many months in active warfare on the other side, and, I am sorry to say, left many of my good friends and comrades over there from my own division.

Let me tell the Senator that it is necessary to fight these imaginary battles before men can go out and fight the real battles. They have to learn how to go forward under artillery fire. They have to learn where the machine guns should be placed during an advance or a retreat. They have to know all the firing data that must be figured to put over an attack. The infantry has to be trained as to how it shall go forward and take cover, so that men will not be killed unnecessarily. The staff have to assume that they, too, are engaged in battle, and that so and so happens, so that they may obtain the knowledge of how to make quick decisions to the best interests of all concerned, so that life can be husbanded and not wasted; and where life was wasted in the war it was due to the fact that there was insufficient time to train a man so that he could rely on himself to a large degree.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield further to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. BROOKHART. The inadequacy of the training was more to blame than the lack of time. There was plenty of time. The Army could have been trained in marksmanship in one-fourth of the time that was used upon it; but there was not anybody in the Army high enough up that knew anything about how to train it, because they conceived the theory, and taught it in the books and in the schools, that a poor shot gets more hits in battle than a good one. That is no joke. For a whole generation that was the idea of the General Staff of the United States Army. I fought them on that theory for 15 years, so I know how it came out. I was with them about a year after it was over, in the school at Benning, studying the lessons of the World War. Their experts all came back there, and I helped establish the school at Camp Benning, and all that sort of thing; but I will say to the Senator that the elaborateness, the technical data involved in doing all these things are double and treble what is necessary to get straight to the point. After all, however, the main things you do in the Army are forgotten in all the maze of technical stuff with which they surround them; and that is not only true of marksmanship, but it is true of every phase of the training in the Army.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me portray to the Senator's mind the difficulty of preparing, for example, a machine-gun attack on an enemy train. First of all, we will assume that our own troops are going forward, and that the machine guns are going to be used like artillery, namely, that they are going to be put on high ground in the rear and shoot over the heads of our own troops. It is necessary to know, therefore, what the trajectory of a bullet is, how high it will go in the air if it is shot 2,000 yards. It is necessary to know, at a certain time, where our troops will be, and what the angle of clearance will be at that particular time.

Mr. BROOKHART. Every trained rifleman knows all that.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; the trained rifleman does not know all that.

Mr. BROOKHART. If he is trained, he does.

Mr. TYDINGS. I want to ask the Senator, if the target out here is 2,150 yards off, and is 60 yards higher than the machine gun, how much the machine gun should be elevated to hit that target, if the gunner can not see it? The Senator is an expert rifleman. Let him answer that question.

Mr. BROOKHART. It all depends upon the distance to the target. From the Senator's question, nobody could tell anything.

Let me recount a little experience about this training.

Mr. TYDINGS. Wait just a moment. We will assume that the Senator can not see the target, but that the target is behind a hill 2,150 yards away, and that it is 60 yards higher than the gun which he is to shoot. How is the Senator going to know how much to elevate the muzzle of his gun in order to hit that target?

Mr. BROOKHART. They had the tables that enabled them to ascertain that almost immediately. It was not any trouble to do that.

Mr. TYDINGS. As one who spent considerable time studying those tables, let me tell the Senator something.

Mr. BROOKHART. I think a good marksman would need to spend a couple of days on them, maybe; but let me recount just a little experience in regard to training in the war.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield for that purpose?

Mr. FRAZIER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BROOKHART. At Camp Benning they sent a young lieutenant by the name of Wood over to be our instructor in liaison, communications in battle. He had particularly distinguished himself in the Battle of Cantigny, the first battle of the First Division. He was sent over as our instructor at Benning. Then the armistice was signed, and the big classes that were to come to us never came; but they sent the West Point graduates down there for training. They came to us to be trained, and we were lecturing around the staff, lecturing one another, getting ready for those West Point classes, and Lieutenant Wood put on his lecture.

He had everything charted up in a very orderly shape. Down in the middle of it, however, he had a black line; and he said, "There was a time in battle when you went over the top when communications ceased, and even a corporal was not able to communicate orders to his squad; and then they reorganized afterward as soon as possible." He described the Battle of Cantigny, how they went over the top and advanced to their dig-in point, and then the trouble was to hold it against the counterattack.

The first counterattack was made by units of the Prussian Guard, among the very best of the German soldiers, and they advanced by individual rushes. One man would jump up and rush forward, and then another, and another, and drop down again, but still they kept a tolerably straight line, they had such well-trained soldiers in that line. Lieutenant Wood said about 20 per cent of these American soldiers had had some rifle training, and I am sure from my experience not more than that had it. So these riflemen looked through their sights at those men as they came, and they dropped them. There was one that got down to their dig-in line, and was killed close in front of it, and that ended the counterattack. He said it was a victory for the Springfield rifles.

When the second counterattack came, there were seven big German tanks in it. They put their 1-pounders, those little guns, on them, and they bounced off like rubber balls; but the infantry supporting those tanks was coming along. These riflemen aimed their sights at that infantry support, and there was no infantry support when they were down within some 75 or 100 yards; and the tanks without the support turned and went back, and the second counterattack was defeated—another victory, he said, for the Springfield rifles.

The next day the commandant of our school called that boy in and said to him as he stood up stiff at attention, "You were brought over here to teach communications, and not to teach that communications ceased; and you will leave out that part of your lecture hereafter."

This young man was heartbroken, because he had most faithfully worked out that system according to his actual experience in battle. I do not know why he came to me. Perhaps he had found that I had a little human trait in me; but he told me the story—something that he had no right to do under the discipline of the school. Then I said to him, "I am on for a lecture down there to-night, and my subject is 'The Man,' and I can put on almost anything in the world under that subject, so come down, and I will have a section on communications in battle as they relate to rifle training."

We went into the class that night, and I said, as I looked over at the commandant, "The most important fact that the soldier must know and that the trainer must know is that we are going to reach a stage in modern battle, perhaps, when communications will cease, and the rifleman himself must be trained to know that before he goes into battle, and must be trained to be his own general and take care of himself during that period and reorganize after that period is over"; and Lieutenant Wood went ahead with his lecture and never changed it, and I was not called on the carpet, either.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, this colloquy with regard to the World War reminds me of that particular period. I had the honor to be governor of my State during the years of the World War. We had only one division of the National Guard in the State at the beginning of the war, and I authorized the forming of a second division. Both divisions went over, across the Atlantic, early in the game and made an excellent record. Men from those divisions told me that they were ready to go to the front lines of battle months before the generals of the allied forces would allow them to go in. They said the theory of the great generals of France and England was that the American soldiers were not trained well enough; that they could not possibly be trained well enough to take part in those great battles in the short time they had been training. Finally, however, a day came when the allied armies were being pushed back, and it looked as if the Germans were going to take Paris; and so, as a last resort, they called in the American Army that the great officers over there said were untrained.

Many of our North Dakota boys went into the First Division of the great World War. They told me that from the time the American Army went in the Germans were held, and not only held but driven back, and they kept on going back from that time on; and the fact that the American soldiers did not go into the front lines a month before they did was because they were kept out by the allied generals who were in command over there. I am sure it was not General Pershing's fault that our men did not go in much earlier than they did.

Mr. President, I want to read a little statement from a member of the House committee in the hearings held last June before the Naval Committee of the House. Mr. McCLINTIC said:

I do not think it is good policy, and I think we will get into a lot of trouble if we try to take it on the floor—

Referring to this same bill—

and pass it at this session, in view of the fact that we have a big controversy existing right now. The minds of the American people are divided as to whether or not we should agree upon the program which was laid out in the London conference, and if we do not agree, then this whole subject is open once more for consideration. If that is true, and the minds of the lawmakers of England and the minds of a majority of the American people are in favor of building up the kind of units, or categories, as they are called, that will be most likely to be used in the next war, certainly it would mean the reduction of battleships. I do not want to be put in the position of voting for a lot of money that would not do us any more good than if we took it out in the middle of the ocean and sunk it.

The Senator from Virginia seemed to think the other day that there was little or no opposition to a bill modernizing these battleships. Yet opposition has developed every time it has been proposed. The Senator from Virginia made the argument, when this measure was up a few days ago, that the bill provided only for the authorization of an appropriation, "authorized hereby at a total cost not to exceed \$30,000,000 in all." He stated that we would have just as

good a chance to fight the appropriation as the authorization; that the authorization did not amount to much. A little later on the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. JONES] came on the floor, and this was the statement he made in that regard:

Mr. JONES. If it is merely an authorization, that is really the important thing, because the Appropriations Committee are practically bound by the authorization.

Of course, Mr. President, when an appropriation is authorized by the Congress it is invariably the fact that the appropriation is made, so far as my experience goes, at least, since I have been here.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I know of many authorizations where appropriations have not been made. I will say, however, that in most of the cases they were introduced perhaps with the knowledge that the appropriations would not be made. I simply say this to let the Senator know that there have been cases, and many of them, where appropriations have been authorized and the appropriations have never been made.

Mr. FRAZIER. That may be very true.

Now, Mr. President, I want to read a few extracts from statements which have been made recently on this subject. Here is one from the New York Telegram of December 29, 1930, where Heywood Broun is quoted as saying:

As far as the average American is concerned, Prof. Albert Einstein has offered a theory even more startling than that of relativity. I am referring to his espousal of militant pacifism and his frank advice that men and women should resist all forms of military training even in time of peace.

Of course, others have offered a program just as drastic, but Professor Einstein is able to abrogate one particular accusation which has been made frequently against all who are total abstinents in the matter of war.

It has been frequently said—and often believed—that pacifism might be an excellent thing as an ideal but that it was a doctrine supported only by dreamers, sentimentalists, and romanticists.

Only the first of these three terms can have any possible connection with the great German philosophical mathematician. Imagination is a necessary component in the mind of anyone who ventures into a cosmic hypothesis.

Professor Einstein shocked a great many of our people by his stand in regard to doing away with military training. One of the leaders of the American Legion out in the great State of California tried to prevent Einstein from speaking out there because he was advocating peace instead of war.

I have here several letters, one of which I will read a part. This letter was written to me by a man I happen to know quite well; a man who had a good deal of experience in the World War. He was the man who invented the most effective bombs used by the United States Government in the World War. He is an engineer and an aviator. He used to be a sailor and was educated along that line. I think he knows what he is talking about. This letter was written from Stamford, Conn., January 3, 1931, by Lester P. Barlow. I might say that Lester P. Barlow is working on a national motorways system at the present time. He is an eminent engineer and has had a great deal of experience, as I have said, in the war game. The letter is addressed to me and reads as follows:

I understand that on January 6 a motion to reconsider the bill authorizing an appropriation of \$30,000,000 for the modernization of three old battleships will be brought up for discussion. As an old salt of the battleship school and as a modern industrial engineer, I am going to stick my oar in as being opposed to the appropriation of \$30,000,000 for the reconditioning of old battleships, on the ground that such expenditure would be more than 100 per cent waste, due to the fact that additional appropriations would be required to keep these antiquated fighting machines in the struggle for existence, which should not be tolerated by the American people. Battleships are as antiquated to meet modern military requirements as the bow and arrow, and are a far greater liability.

Mr. President, it costs, in round figures, at least a million dollars each year to man and operate a battleship. The letter proceeds:

They are too slow and cumbersome to get out of a fight, and utterly incapable of being victorious in battle when met by modern military engines of war.

I speak as an authority, as a former first-class gun pointer in the United States naval service, and as one of the pioneers in the

equipping of the United States naval ships with wireless telegraphy. In fact, the first ship ever to sail from a Pacific port thus equipped was U. S. S. *Solace* in 1904. I was a member of the crew and an understudy in the new wireless marvel which the Navy was then experimenting with.

After leaving the naval service in 1908 I became interested in aviation and organized and commanded the first aerial bombing squadron in military operation in the world's history, in 1914, in the Mexican revolution. I came out of that revolution with the designs of the well-known Barlow aircraft munitions, for the building of which the Congress of the United States during the World War appropriated over \$300,000,000. I have for many years been accepted as an authority on aircraft armament. I built the first synchronized aircraft gun in this country, and from that model came the famous Marlin-Rockwell aircraft gun, the finest aircraft machine gun used during the World War, over 38,000 of them being built and used by the Allies.

The first records of the suggestion for the use of depth mines are shown in the correspondence of the United States Navy and in letters to me, in May, 1916, criticizing my suggestions for the attack of naval craft (both under water and on the surface) by hydrostatic pressure developed by power submerged explosions. I contended at that time that it was not necessary to hit a ship, but it was only necessary to sink explosives near naval craft in order to destroy them. The Navy at that time insisted that I apply contact-firing devices to my depth mines. After the war General Mitchell proved that my suggested principles were the most effective methods for use in the destruction of individual craft. He sunk every type of naval craft, including submarines, torpedo boats, light cruisers, heavy cruisers, and battleships; and in most of these attacks Barlow bombs were used for the destruction of the ships by aircraft bombing. Some of these ships were 100 miles from the coast and in the open sea. And yet, 10 years later, we are simple enough to listen to prehistoric granddads and their plea for \$30,000,000 to recondition old battleships.

If a war should develop, we would rapidly place these battleships in land-locked harbors and spend millions of dollars defending them against aircraft attack. This \$30,000,000 appropriation, if allowed, would be for the sole benefit of certain shipyards which desire the contracts for what there is in them.

I think he is absolutely correct in that statement.

The next war will not be fought in front-line trenches or by battleship formation. The American people should have had sufficient demonstration by this time of the practicability of aircraft to realize, without doubting the fact, that the next war will be in the air. This Nation is particularly fortunate in having thousands of miles of water to the east and to the west, with friendly nations at the north and south. Our military program should principally be the development of an aircraft program as a defense measure against invasion. There is justification in the belief that modern submarines and aircraft carriers will play an important part in the next war. There will be some use for light and extremely high-speed cruisers; but every unit of the military equipment of the future must be designed for and be capable of high speed. The most dangerous place for combatants in the next war, in so far as military units are concerned, will be aboard battleships.

The nerve centers of the Nation will be the objectives of all attacks in future wars, and these attacks will be made from great distances, both by bombing squadrons and by flying torpedoes. The military authorities of this Nation know of the practicability of the flying torpedo of great power and weight and of tremendous range. The military authorities can tell the Senators that we were actually planning the construction of gigantic torpedoes during the last war, and if the war had lasted another six months torpedoes of 1,000-mile range, carrying 5,000 pounds of T. N. T., would have been in actual use. In fact, General Squires during the war held the well-known aircraft manufacturer, Glenn L. Martin, and myself to the greatest secrecy and told us that thousands of these torpedoes must be constructed and available before the first one was launched into the enemies' territory.

General Mitchell has told the Military Affairs Committee of the House that the next war will be fought at long distance and with flying torpedoes. Recently the British have announced the successful development of long-range, high-powered aerial torpedoes, and military authorities in this country have contended that the British invention is a direct copy of the American Government's torpedoes as planned during the war. Thirty millions of dollars applied to the construction of these murderous engines of war would give this Nation a reserve of 600 flying torpedoes, each capable of carrying tons of explosives or poison gas and each having a range of over a thousand miles. If carried by swift ships of the aircraft type, we could strike cities a thousand miles distant from the ship, and each torpedo would strike with terrific destructive force, utterly demoralizing the city of its objective. Consider this form of attack and compare it with the weak and hopeless attempts which might be made in the future by battleships. Comparing the battleships with modern aircraft possibilities would be comparing peashooters with Vesuvius. Flying torpedoes would cost approximately \$50,000 apiece, and they will go far in the next war in proving that Christianity is supreme and democracy will be maintained, because thousands will be innocent victims—noncombatants, men, women, and children maimed and killed, while the attackers remain in a comparatively safe and secure position.

What this Nation needs, if she needs anything, is a strong defensive aircraft program. After that she should have, perhaps,

a program for aerial attack of heavy aircraft armament, such as bombers and flying torpedoes.

The certain terribleness of the next war, if it comes, and the awful destruction of our great cities and nerve centers should convince us that we must make every effort possible in bringing about a positive agreement between the leading powers that there must be no future wars. The next war, for all who participate in it, will be annihilation. None can be victorious. Those who advocate war are either insane or positively ignorant. Any so-called military authority who thinks he is justified in advocating that nations should continue to adjust their disputes by military operations, is a menace to the Nation, and I would say this in the face of any military authority.

I was trained in my youth as an expert in the handling of military equipment. I went through the World War, serving with my ingenuity in the development of fiendish and murderous war equipment, and I know that the human mind is so prolific in its conceptions of hellish devices for the legalized murder called war that if this trend is not controlled it will mean complete destruction of everything we call civilization. By all means, Senator FRAZIER, you should do everything you can, not only to block the foolish expenditure of \$30,000,000 for the reconditioning of these old ships, but everything possible that you can do to bring about an early agreement between our Nation and all other leading nations to abandon the idea of the settling of international disputes by man-made machines which will certainly destroy the men who build them if they are ever again brought forward for the purpose of meeting opponents in war. Keep this in mind: There can be no victory for either side—only destruction.

Very truly yours,

LESTER P. BARLOW.

Mr. President, the long-range air torpedoes that he speaks of are, as I understand it, torpedoes placed in an airplane of some kind, directed and controlled by wireless or radio, and can be sent a thousand miles distant. When it comes over a city or any place else where it is desired to drop the torpedo, the operators through their wireless can control it and drop it on almost the identical spot where they desire, even though the control is a thousand miles away. But we are asked, nevertheless, to authorize an appropriation of \$30,000,000 to repair antiquated battleships.

Mr. President, our country has had an experience during the past few years, beginning with the World War, that ought to convince every thinking individual that the only safe plan for this Nation or any other nation is to keep out of future wars. I have a letter which I received this morning which struck me as very appropriate. It came from a lady in New York City, under date of January 14, addressed to me and reading:

I am horrified as I read in the papers from day to day the recurring suggestions of flinging millions of the people's money into military preparations of various sorts. As a taxpayer, rather more modest than before, but still a taxpayer, and even more emphatically as a citizen, I wish to protest against these expenditures and to beg you to speak and vote against every one of them. May I classify my objections under several headings:

1. These proposals to go on arming the United States of America are a flat denial of the Kellogg peace pact. It may be that tongues were in the cheeks of the gentlemen who signed this agreement but, nevertheless, it is an important document because it is believed by we know not how many thousands of our citizens to be a solemn statement that the United States will not again resort to war.

2. Even if there had been no peace pact there have been several disarmament conferences, understood by citizens to be called, carried on, and concluded for the purpose of reducing armaments. By continuing to make military expenditures we show ourselves the merest hypocrites. The time may come when we shall wish the rest of the world to believe in our good intentions. It will be slow to do so if we have continued to act in this two-faced manner.

3. Is it the wish of our Representatives in Congress to bring on a war? If not, they should vote against military preparations. The extravagant sums we have spent and are proposing to spend are a constant excitement to politicians in other countries. When it serves the temporary advantage of any of them to do so, they can point to our lavish military preparations and say, "In the face of such obvious hostility on the part of America can you hesitate to follow me?" Moreover, the fact that we are armed to the teeth makes it possible for such politicians to attribute to every slight misunderstanding, every unimportant incident, a desire on our part to start a war.

Mr. President, that paragraph, to my mind, is very true. The very fact that the Secretary of the Navy himself justifies the expenditure of the \$30,000,000 provided in the bill now before us on the ground that it will bring the United States Navy up to a parity and up to an equality with Great Britain's Navy, justifies the statement.

The letter continues:

4. If there are 5,000,000 persons out of work it is a fair estimate that the income of at least 2,000,000 families is less. When the people are having to do without the ordinary comforts which the American standard of living demands it is hardly appropriate for their representatives to burden them with additional military expenditures.

Legislators may forget it, but thinking people do not forget that in the end every cent voted by legislators comes out of the individual citizens, either through income taxes or in the higher cost of every article he consumes. Every family is struggling to live within its income, to put itself on a sound financial basis. It is clearly the duty of our representatives to see to it that the Government does not waste money by increasing military expenses. This is clearly a time for retrenchment in every line.

5. If the Republican Party wishes to secure confidence in its ability to serve the Nation, it can only hope to do so by rigid economy in Government expenditures and sincere efforts to improve international friendship. On all these scores a reduction of military expenditures becomes necessary.

I urge you to vote against all these military appropriation bills and to call the attention of the amendment to your colleagues as frequently as possible.

Sincerely yours,

ELIZABETH ELLSWORTH COOK.

I think this lady is absolutely correct. In the hard times facing us we should retrench in expenses. It seems to me it is worse than foolish, worse than criminal to increase our expenditures for preparation for war instead of cutting down those items. In the face of the fact that we have adopted the Kellogg peace pact, in the face of the fact that we have gone into the London disarmament conference and agreed there to cut down, and have cut down to some extent by the scrapping of three old battleships which only recently cost us \$11,000,000 to modernize, it is worse than criminal to increase our expenditures for preparation for war. But now we are asked for \$30,000,000 more to modernize some more of our old battleships that will undoubtedly be scrapped following the next disarmament conference, which will probably be held within the next year or two.

Mr. President, I have here the figures of loans made by the United States to European countries. Just after the close of the war the amount exceeded \$11,500,000,000. Some of these foreign debts have been practically canceled, the interest rates have been reduced, and yet we are denied a small appropriation of \$15,000,000 to supply food and clothing for farmers in our country who were hit by the drought during the last season, who have not the money to buy food to feed their families, their wives and children.

When anyone tells us that the United States Congress is not to blame for these conditions, it seems to me they are making a statement that is absolutely incorrect, to say the least. I am not trying to contend that Congress is responsible for the drought—of course not—but I do contend it is responsible for the condition of the farmers of the country, for the condition of the working people of the country. The highest purpose of the Government, in my opinion, is for the benefit and protection of the common people of the Nation, who need their protection, and not for the benefit and protection of the great corporations, who do not need governmental protection.

O Mr. President, the fact that 5,000,000 men and women are out of employment and that we have many bread lines proves to me that the Congress of the United States has been derelict in its duty in providing for those people. The fact that farmers in Arkansas and many other States, because of crop failures or the drought last season, are financially situated so that they can not feed their families during the present winter is a sad indictment of the attitude of the Congress of the United States toward the farmer during all the past years.

Ten years ago, Mr. President, deflation was brought on by the Federal Reserve Board. The Federal reserve system was created by an act of Congress, and so again the Congress of the United States is responsible, indirectly at least, for the deflation thus inaugurated. That deflation hit the farmers first; it deflated them by the thousand. They became broke and went out of business. There is no doubt about the cause of that condition, in my opinion, because I come from a great agricultural State where that deflation struck and where banks failed. I think that perhaps

North Dakota was the first State in which banks began to fail after that deflation. The newspapers throughout the Nation heralded the failure of those banks to the world and stated that the failure was caused by the so-called bolshevik government of North Dakota. However, only a few months later banks began to fail in other agricultural States, and now there are a number of other States which have a worse record for bank failures than has the State of North Dakota. Some of the individual banks which have failed in the East have had more deposits than all the banks in North Dakota which have gone broke during the last 10 years. When a bank fails, especially where its assets have practically all been used up in trying to keep it going, or in the hope that conditions would improve and it could ultimately pay its depositors, the result is perhaps worse than it otherwise would have been, and the depositors lose practically all of their deposits. In many instances they have lost their life savings. Many farmers who have spent their lives building up homes for their families have, because of the deflation brought about by the Federal Reserve Board, because of the increased cost of operations, due to increased overhead expenses and increased taxes, because of the low prices of farm products, because of the poor crop conditions in the various States during the past few years, and because also of the high prices they have had to pay for everything they have had to buy, have lost their all and have been compelled to go out of business.

Mr. President, one does not have to go to Arkansas to find farmers who are hard up; one does not have to go to New York City to find men and women who are out of employment. Right here in the streets of the National Capital there are many men and women looking for jobs. Every charitable institution in the city of Washington is taxed to its utmost capacity every day and every night to shelter, feed, and try to find employment for men and women who are in need and to provide for destitute families. So also on the farms of old Virginia, up in Pennsylvania, in West Virginia, in Maryland, and other States, in the vicinity of Washington as well as in New England, there are farmers and their families who are actually in want to-day, through no fault of their own, but who are in this condition because the United States Congress has not protected them; it has not protected their business as it has protected the business of the manufacturers and other industries that deal with the farmers.

Yet, Mr. President, we are asked to appropriate \$30,000,000 to modernize three old battleships. What for? I do not think there is a single logical argument that can be advanced why those three old battleships should be modernized. I had a letter yesterday from a lady in Oklahoma. As a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Indian Affairs, I recently visited Oklahoma, and happened to meet this lady while I was there. After referring to conditions among the Indians, she winds up her letter with this statement:

I wish to express the hope that little children will not longer be forced to eat dry flour or to reach to the bottom of the garbage pail hoping to find a biscuit. Both happened here.

Yet some Senators and others say such conditions as that are no fault of the Congress, no fault of the Government, and that it is not the place of Congress to remedy them; let the Red Cross take care of those in distress. Oh, Mr. President, I can not appreciate that kind of argument. The Red Cross has done exceedingly good work; there is no doubt about that; but the argument that the Red Cross should take care of the people of the United States who to-day are suffering and in distress does not appeal to me because it is made on the assumption that the wealthy people are going to contribute to the Red Cross. Of course, wealthy people and rich corporations who have made their money at the expense of the common people, who have been forced to live under conditions such as we have in the United States, under the domination of the so-called great financial interests, can contribute large sums to the Red Cross to take care of the poor unfortunates at this time, and the newspapers will praise them as great philanthropists

and see that they get a lot of publicity—and I suppose that is what they want—but their donations will be deducted from the amount of the profits on which they will have to pay income taxes, and that will help them to some extent, I presume.

The Red Cross drive was not started until after the first of the year, so that contributions will not be allowed as deductions from the 1930 tax which will be due on the 15th of March, and that, too, will help to some extent. The contributions may, however, be deducted from the income-tax return for the current year. Mr. President, the fact that we have great corporations with their millions, the fact that we have individuals who are millionaires who have made immense fortunes at the expense of the common people, does not appeal to me as an argument why the United States Congress should not take care of these poor people, but should instead call for contributions to the Red Cross.

Mr. President, farming conditions have been going from bad to worse for the last 10 years. Millions of our farmers have gone broke and are now out of business, and there is hunger and suffering throughout the Nation, both on the farm and on the part of men and women who have been thrown out of employment. The farmers have lost their purchasing power. Because of poor crop conditions, because of low prices for their products they have not been able to meet their necessary expenses, and many of them have fallen behind in their taxes and have been foreclosed. That has happened to millions of farmers throughout the United States, not only in the Middle West but in the South and in every agricultural State in the Union. I repeat, the purchasing power of the farmers has gone down so that they can not buy the necessities of life. What is the result? The result is that the great manufacturing institutions in the East and in the South have been forced to close down, too, because they can not sell the manufactured products which the farmers of this great Nation need and should have, but which they are not able to buy. So the factories and mills have been closed down and 5,000,000 men and women have been thrown out of employment.

Mr. President, there is nothing that looks like immediate relief, so far as I can see. It seems to me that there has got to be a readjustment all along the line. We have been 10 years or more getting into this situation, and it will take some time to get out of it. At the present time the price of the products which the farmer has to sell is below the pre-war price, while the price he has to pay for machinery, for clothing, and for practically everything else he has to buy is almost up to the war price. So the situation is a mighty hard one, and it seems to me there has got to be a readjustment.

The prices of manufactured products, such as machinery, clothing, and all other commodities, must come down so as to be more in proportion to the prices the farmer receives for the commodities he produces on the farm. Until that is done I can see no hope of permanently better times.

We are asked to appropriate \$30,000,000 to modernize three old battleships. Mr. President, there are 3,000,000 farm homes throughout the Nation that also need modernization. It is not necessary to go a dozen miles from the National Capital to find old farm homes that have not been modernized during the last century. There are many of them in this neighborhood that are over a hundred years old and which have not been modernized since they were built. Of course they were modern at the time of their construction, according to the standards of those days; but like the battleships, they have long ago become obsolete and should be modernized. The \$30,000,000 could much better be expended in modernizing farm homes than in modernizing old battleships—just three battleships to be floating palaces for the naval officers who will happen to be in charge of them.

Yesterday in the discussion a statement was made that New York could take care of its own unemployed. I suppose it can, because there is a great amount of wealth in New York; and, as I have said before, that wealth has been

built up out of excessive profits received by business men there, and from money that has been contributed from all over the Nation to business and also to the gambling market in New York—the stock exchanges.

In the recent stock-market flurry a year ago it was estimated that the people of various States of the Nation, including New York, dropped some \$50,000,000,000 because of the manipulations of the gamblers of Wall Street. There is no question, Mr. President, that the people in Wall Street could take care of all the 5,000,000 unemployed if they should see fit so to do, but I do not like that kind of charity. It is an indictment against our Government and against the Congress of the United States to allow conditions to come about that need that kind of charity, and that is not the kind of charity our people want. They are entitled to appropriations from the United States Treasury to help them under these conditions, and, in my opinion, they should have them.

Mr. President, you will remember that during the tariff fight we had a table back here in the corner, and some of the high-tariff men sent out and got a lot of imported articles to show that the little tariff we put on those various manufactured products was not responsible for the high prices we had to pay for those products. So they sent out and got 50 or 100 articles, and had a receipt from the retailer up there to show the regular price that was paid for those articles. Then they looked up the price that was paid in the country where they were manufactured; they looked up the cost of transportation to New York City, what the commission was, what the tariff was, and what the article cost laid down in New York City. Then they figured the percentage of profit on those products.

I remember very well the little Swiss wrist watch that was on the table here for weeks last winter when we were discussing the tariff bill. That little Swiss wrist watch cost \$6 in Switzerland, wholesale. It cost \$2.75 to bring it across to New York and to pay the commission and the tariff on it, making \$8.75 laid down in New York City. It retailed for \$55. Oh, the merchants who sell those wrist watches can afford to take care of a few of the unemployed up there, of course; but it is the fault of the United States Congress that things of that kind are allowed to exist—that any individual merchant is allowed to make a profit of 600 per cent on an article that he imports from Switzerland or any other country. Yet that sort of thing is allowed to go on, even with the hard conditions we are facing. When millions of our people are practically facing starvation at the present time, this profiteering is allowed to go on; and worst of all, it seems to me, we are called upon to authorize the appropriation of more money for preparation for war in peace times.

As I stated in the beginning, last year we spent the largest amount for the United States Navy and Army that we have ever spent in peace times. We are asked to appropriate more this year than we spent last year. The Navy appropriation last year amounted to more than \$1,000,000 a day. The Army appropriation last year amounted to more than \$1,000,000 a day. I want to repeat that every minute during the fiscal year of 1930, ending the 1st day of last July, for the United States Navy they spent over \$700, more than twice as much as the average farmer of this Nation makes in an entire year.

I hope, when the vote is finally taken on this measure, that the bill will be voted down. To my mind it is a crying shame to say to the great nations of this world—the 53 nations that we influenced to sign the Kellogg peace pact—that we did not mean what we said by the Kellogg peace pact; that we are preparing for war; that we are appropriating practically twice as much as we ever appropriated before in peace times in preparation for war.

Mr. President, I do not like that kind of a reputation for the United States Government and for the United States Congress. So I hope that every Member will carefully consider this measure before a vote is taken, and when the vote comes will vote according to the dictates of his conscience for the interest of the common people of this Nation, who,

if you please, put up the money to pay this \$30,000,000 and every other appropriation that we make here in the United States Congress.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat, will he suffer an interruption?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. FRAZIER. I do.

Mr. KING. As I understand the parliamentary situation, the motion to reconsider was agreed to, and the bill is now upon the calendar and is subject to amendment; so there will not be a vote upon the question of reconsideration.

Mr. FRAZIER. We agreed to vote at 4 o'clock to-morrow afternoon upon amendments and the motion, as I understand.

Mr. KING. Yes; but it will not be a vote upon the motion to reconsider, for the reason that we have already reconsidered our action on the bill, and it is restored to the calendar and is in the same situation as any other bill, except for the provision as to the time when the vote shall be taken.

Mr. FRAZIER. I thank the Senator from Utah for that explanation.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah is right. We reconsidered the bill by unanimous consent. It is reconsidered and is before the Senate now; so the vote will be on the bill itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state, for the information of Senators, that the vote the Senate will take to-morrow will be on reconsidering the vote by which the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time. That is the parliamentary situation.

#### DROUGHT RELIEF

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from [Iowa Mr. BROOKHART] whether he desires to proceed at this time. If not, I should like to take up the Interior Department appropriation bill.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I do not desire to proceed on the Meyer matter until we come to it. On this matter I desire to speak for only a few minutes, and I would rather do so to-morrow than now.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me to call up the Senate resolution that went over?

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator to wait until I get the appropriation bill up. I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. FRAZIER. Before the Senator from Utah asks unanimous consent, I think it would be only fair to ask if any other Senator desires to speak on this matter at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly. No one responded, and I thought no one else desired to speak.

Mr. FLETCHER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Frazier	King	Shipstead
Barkley	George	La Follette	Shortridge
Bingham	Gillett	McGill	Simmons
Black	Glass	McKellar	Smith
Blaine	Glenn	McMaster	Smoot
Borah	Goff	McNary	Steiwer
Bratton	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Stephens
Brock	Gould	Morrison	Swanson
Brookhart	Hale	Morrow	Thomas, Idaho
Bulkley	Harris	Moses	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Harrison	Norbeck	Townsend
Caraway	Hastings	Norris	Trammell
Carey	Hatfield	Nye	Tydings
Connally	Hawes	Oddie	Vandenberg
Copeland	Hayden	Partridge	Wagner
Couzens	Hebert	Patterson	Walcott
Cutting	Heffin	Pine	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Howell	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Davis	Johnson	Reed	Waterman
Deneen	Jones	Robinson, Ark.	Watson
Dill	Kean	Robinson, Ind.	Wheeler
Fess	Kendrick	Schall	Williamson
Fletcher	Keyes	Sheppard	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 14675, the bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, pending the request I suggest an additional provision, as follows. And that it be in order to consider upon the bill the following amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add, at the proper place in the bill:

There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$25,000,000 (in addition to such sums as may be or may become available through voluntary contributions) to be expended by the Red Cross for the purpose of supplying food to persons otherwise unable to procure the same.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I wish to modify the amendment so as to insert, following the word "contributions," the words "to be immediately available and."

If the Senator from Michigan will indulge me just a moment to explain the matter, I think it will not be necessary to repeat the amendment. I think the Senate understands it.

Yesterday I gave notice that when the agricultural appropriation bill was brought forward the amendment just read would be offered to that bill, and, if necessary, a motion to suspend the rules would be made; but upon further consideration of the matter it seems to me that the amendment had best be incorporated in the bill which has had some consideration by the Senate, and which the Senator from Utah is seeking to bring forward now by unanimous consent.

Frankly, Mr. President, I do not wish to delay or interfere with the consideration of appropriation bills; and I think the Senate knows that it is my purpose and policy to facilitate, in every possible way, conclusions respecting them. But the Senator from Utah is asking unanimous consent. He is asking to lay aside temporarily the business which, under the order of the Senate, is before it, and to proceed to the consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill. Now, my request is that the Senate waive the rule which would, unless suspended, prevent the consideration of this amendment, in order that the Senate may express its opinion concerning it.

Senators may just as well take notice of the fact now as hereafter that this amendment, or some similar amendment, is going to be considered and voted on in the Senate. It will be subject to amendment or revision. All I am asking now is the opportunity to avail myself of the same privilege and opportunity the Senator from Utah is invoking, in order to secure action by the Senate on a proposition in which many Senators are greatly interested. I hope the Senator from Utah will find himself able to consent to the suggestion, in so far as he is authorized to do so.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. Yesterday the able Senator gave notice of a motion to suspend the rules in order that he might offer to the agricultural appropriation bill the amendment to which he now addresses himself. I understand that later, and on this day, he has offered the same proposal to the bill now sought to be brought to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I am not offering the amendment. I am asking now an opportunity to have it considered. That is all I want. If the Senate does not desire the amendment, it can express itself to that effect. If this amendment should be incorporated in the bill now sought to be brought before the Senate by the Senator from Utah, it would not be necessary to present it in connection with the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate that thoroughly. I wanted to know if there were two applications for suspension of the

rules, one with reference to the agricultural appropriation bill and one with reference to the Interior Department appropriation bill, or whether the Senator has forsaken the idea of offering the amendment to the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have not forsaken anything. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that unless this consent is granted, I shall give the same notice with respect to the Interior Department appropriation bill that I gave with respect to the agricultural appropriation bill, and unless this unanimous consent is granted and the Senate given an opportunity to express itself on the subject, I will then seek to suspend the rule and have the amendment incorporated. If the rules are not suspended and the amendment is not incorporated in the Interior Department appropriation bill, I will present it to the agricultural appropriation bill in the way I indicated yesterday.

I have said all I wish to say at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Arkansas that I have no authority from the Committee on Appropriations to accept that amendment, and therefore I will have to object to it at this time.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I am not offering the amendment now.

Mr. SMOOT. I should have said amendment to my request. My request is to take up the Interior Department appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the request of the Senator from Arkansas is in order.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I am not asking the Senator from Utah to accept the amendment. I would not do that. I desire an expression from the Senate on that. I realize the Senator is entitled to demand that. All I am requesting is this, while he is asking me to waive a technicality which would prevent him, without the unanimous consent of this body, from proceeding with the bill in which he is interested, to extend the same courtesy to me and waive the technicality which would prevent me from having an expression, without extraordinary proceeding, on the amendment I shall propose. The matter will still be left open to the Senate for discussion and for the acceptance or rejection of the amendment. All I am asking is that the Senate waive the technical rule which forbids us from considering such an amendment as this under the circumstances under which it is presented. We have done that every day since the Senate has been in session. We are asked now to waive the rule or order which forbids the Senate from considering the Interior Department appropriation bill except by unanimous consent. I attach to the request of the Senator from Utah, not a request that my amendment be accepted but that the rule which forbids its consideration be waived. It is within the province of the Senate to say whether it desires to do that.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, with what information I have, it seems to me it is my duty now to withdraw my request for the consideration of the bill at this time, and I therefore withdraw it.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, if I understand the situation, it appears to me that the request of the Senator from Arkansas is in order, and that it should be acceded to.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I do not wish to intrude or to delay the matter. The Senator from Utah seeks to take up a very important appropriation bill. I think it should be taken up. But, for reasons which the Senator from Arkansas has briefly indicated, but which he could elaborate, he asks that if he grants consent, and if we all grant consent, to take up the Interior Department appropriation bill, the Senator may be permitted to offer a certain amendment to it.

Here we are, supposedly thoughtful men, able to indicate the points of the compass. What harm can come or be in suspending the rule which, I understand, precludes the offering of this particular amendment? We will all express ourselves hereafter in respect to the merits of the amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That is right.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. And the Senator does not ask us immediately to do so. I hope, I sincerely hope, that unanimous consent will be given to the taking up of the Interior Department appropriation bill, and that unanimous consent will be given whereby the Senator from Arkansas may offer his suggested amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California, and he will bear me witness that I have objected to no request from the Senator from Utah. He made a request asking every Senator to waive the rules of the Senate, and I supplemented that by adding a request that the rules be otherwise waived, not in order that the Senator might accept the amendment but in order that the Senate might express itself on the amendment. The Senator from Utah can take any course he wishes to take.

#### THE GOLD STANDARD AND THE SILVER SITUATION

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, on December 5 I introduced a bill (S. 4848) to prohibit the importation into the United States of any article or merchandise from the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. The dumping of soviet products on the world's markets dislocates trade and accentuates the maldistribution of gold, increasing international competition for the metal and intensifying and prolonging world economic depression and unemployment.

Mr. H. N. Lawrie, formerly economic adviser to the Senate Commission of Gold and Silver Inquiry, of which I had the honor to be the chairman, made an address before the New York section of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers on October 22, 1930, on The Maintenance of the Gold Standard and an address before the District of Columbia section of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers on December 18, 1930, on The Silver Situation. As an outstanding authority on gold and silver, Mr. Lawrie has made available in these addresses much valuable information and makes some constructive suggestions. He also points out that soviet fiat currency depreciating in value makes it possible without resort to convict labor to dump its products on the world's markets at artificially low prices, with which other nations can not compete. Furthermore, Mr. Lawrie shows that soviet dumping operations constitute an attack on the gold standard in the Occident and the silver standard in the Orient.

In view of the importance of the subjects discussed and the valuable information presented, I ask that these addresses be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF H. N. LAWRIE, ECONOMIST, OF WASHINGTON, D. C., FORMER ECONOMIC ADVISER TO THE UNITED STATES SENATE COMMISSION OF GOLD AND SILVER INQUIRY, BEFORE THE NEW YORK SECTION OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF MINING AND METALLURGICAL ENGINEERS

#### THE MAINTENANCE OF THE GOLD STANDARD

From earliest history gold has never ceased to be a problem, and it will probably continue to become more acute as the demand for the metal increases with the expanding requirements of credit and currency to finance world industry and trade. The gold standard has weathered many serious storms and in the present crisis, although more complicated than heretofore, adequate safeguards will be developed for its continuation. The world has greatly benefited by the gold standard, and the public interest can best be served by providing for its maintenance.

#### GOLD-STANDARD ADVANTAGES

The great value of the gold standard lies not so much in its service as a unit of value but in the safeguards it supplies against undue inflation and in the principles of sound currency and credit policies which must be carried into effect in order that a nation receive the maximum benefit from a strong creditor position in the world. The gold standard constitutes the best basis for measuring accurately financial probity and honesty in national business and the financial progress of nations. No substitute has yet been found which could better serve the public interest. Discussions of the question have been frequent since 1921, when postwar deflation began, and so far the consideration of a substitute for the gold standard has been largely academic.

The fact is that the merits of the gold standard were and still are so great that the maintenance of the gold standard was assured

in 1921, and is now not seriously jeopardized by the present discussion of the prospects of decline in the world's future gold production.

#### PRESENT DEPRESSION

The world's gold production in 1921 was \$330,000,000, from which it declined, despite the major price deflation in that year, to \$319,000,000 in 1922. Since 1922 the production has increased each year to a maximum of \$406,000,000 in 1928. Prior to 1915 the continually increasing gold production was the cause of alarm, because to it was attributed rising prices, and the matter of international control of gold production was discussed as a means of preventing undue currency and credit inflation. How, therefore, could the world's gold production, which has increased since 1922, be held in any way accountable for the price declines in 1929 and 1930? It would seem more logical to conclude that had it not been for the increasing supply of new gold since 1922, the price recessions which have occurred since would have been still greater.

Causes other than inadequate gold production for recent price declines must be found. One of the most logical contributory causes suggested is that goods are not exchanging on a normal basis, resulting in depriving certain nations of gold which are in need of it and in supplying an excess of gold to other nations which would be better off without it. With the exception of Russia, the foundations of national business are generally sound, and the present depression and dislocation of gold may be regarded as temporary. The necessary readjustment of trade and gold distribution can be greatly expedited by the closer cooperation, the greater functional coordination, and the more aggressive action of the central banks of the principal gold-standard countries.

#### THE GOLD PROBLEM

Variations which have so far occurred in recent decades in the annual gold production of the world constitute such infinitesimal fractions of the world's monetary stock of more than \$17,000,000,000 that the influence of such variations on prices must be almost negligible. The gold problem confronting the world to-day does not therefore arise in the near past or even in the present, but is largely a question of the adequacy of future gold supplies to meet the currency and credit requirements, under the sound limitations imposed by the gold standard, of expanding industry and trade. What are the objectives to be sought and what constructive measures may be adopted to insure the maintenance of the gold standard? Let us first state the objectives.

#### GOLD-STANDARD OBJECTIVES

The principal objectives sought through the operation of the gold standard are as follows:

I. Convertibility of currencies into gold at par within the countries of origin as well as in the foreign markets so that stability in domestic and foreign exchanges will be maintained by all countries.

II. The maintenance of prices at levels which will insure full employment without lowering living standards anywhere and on a more stable basis.

III. A supply of currency and credit at reasonable rates of interest, readily available in every country in sufficient quantities to finance normally expanding industry and trade.

IV. To so limit the volumes of currency and credit and their use that great excesses will not be available in any country to finance overproduction or pure speculation.

In stating these objectives for the gold standard, it is realized that they constitute ideals to be attained, but the difficulties should not be regarded as unsurmountable if we are to be successful in perfecting and maintaining the world's monetary system. Let us now consider a summary of constructive measures to facilitate and improve the operation of the gold standard, to create and maintain greater stability in prices, and to insure the maintenance of the gold standard.

#### CONSTRUCTIVE MEASURES

##### I. Economies in the monetary use of gold:

1. With a view to greater economy in the use and transportation of gold and in providing a better distribution of gold at the points of greatest need, the Bank for International Settlements should operate—

- a. A gold and exchange pool.
- b. A credit pool.
- c. A securities pool.

2. In countries where the legal percentages of gold required for deposit liabilities and note covers are higher than necessary to insure convertibility of currencies into gold at par and to meet deposit liabilities, these percentages should be lowered, thereby releasing gold for more important functions of international finance. As in the Federal reserve act, it would be well for penalty charges to apply should the percentages decline below the new percentages to be specified so as to prevent abuses which might lead to inconvertible currencies and credits and to inflation.

3. The further removal of gold from circulation in countries where this can be done without causing inflation and the greatest possible use of silver in effecting settlements, especially in India and China, thereby conserving gold for monetary use which otherwise would be hoarded. Silver might well be more generally used in bank reserves in limited quantities, thereby further supplementing and conserving gold.

##### II. Economies in the industrial use of gold:

1. National restrictions imposed upon the use of gold in the industrial arts.

2. The prevention of currency and credit inflations which, in artificially increasing outstanding purchasing powers, result in greatly increasing the consumption of gold in the industrial arts.

3. To the greatest extent possible the elimination of the lathe in the manufacture of gold articles and the substitution of hand labor therefor.

##### III. Suggestions for increasing gold production:

1. By making available capital on reasonable terms so that—

a. The modern dredge, which has been greatly improved, could be more generally applied to alluvial deposits, many of which could not be worked profitably with the older types of dredges.

b. Large low-grade quartz deposits could be explored and operated on the basis of newly developed economies in mining and milling.

c. Tailings from alluvial and quartz properties and the lower grades of ore left in mines from which the richest ore has been removed, could be treated by the more economical methods resulting from mining and metallurgical improvements.

d. The modification or repeal of laws restricting production, such as the antidébris law of California.

2. By encouraging prospecting not only in the productive areas but also in those regions which so far have not been well investigated. If the manufacturers of gold would evidence an interest in assisting to finance the prospecting and development of gold properties it would be very helpful in increasing the production of new gold to meet the world's industrial and monetary requirements.

3. With a view to reducing costs of gold production, encouragements should be given to those who perfect improved and less expensive methods of mining and milling gold ores.

IV. If given a satisfactory trial and these measures to economize in the monetary and industrial use of gold and in stimulating production do not prove sufficiently effective in supplying enough new gold to meet the increasing requirements of industry and trade, the Bank for International Settlements could contract with producers for gold to be recovered from gold-bearing material that can not be profitably mined under present economic conditions at the price of \$20.67 per ounce. No more profitable use of the earnings of the Bank for International Settlements could be made in the interest of its stockholders. From marginal gold ore deposits a substantial gold reserve for emergency use could be accumulated at small additional cost, and this would prove to be the least expensive and most effective method of averting gold crises and of maintaining international equilibrium in the operation of the gold standard.

#### MONETARY ECONOMIES

A compilation of the net gold, credit, and securities items in the foreign trade of the United States for the years 1923-1929, inclusive, shows a net efflux of gold of \$175,000,000, a net gain of \$421,000,000 in credit, and a net efflux of American capital invested in foreign securities of \$3,592,000,000. (See Table I.)

It will be observed that the volume of securities movements is many times that of gold and credit combined and indicates not only that this country has exported a great deal of capital abroad for the purpose of financing exports but also suggests the possibility of using to the greatest extent security-arbitrage transactions in effecting international settlements.

#### SECURITIES MOVEMENTS

Emphasizing the possible future importance of security-arbitrage transactions, Dr. Ray Hall, of the finance and investment division of the Department of Commerce, states as follows (Trade Information Bulletin No. 698):

"Once a security, whether American or foreign, is listed both on our exchange and on one or more foreign exchanges, price leveling starts almost automatically by arbitrage brokers buying in the cheap market and selling in the dear market. These transactions occur with nearly every important fluctuation in the price of the security. At New York they average about 25,000 shares a day and sometimes reach as high as 200,000 shares a day." (Magazine of Wall Street, July, 1929.) This volume of transactions would probably involve market values of something like \$750,000,000 a year. Most of these transactions are quickly 'washed out,' but in many cases actual deliveries of securities must be made.

"It looks now as if these security-arbitrage transactions might sometime become the foremost settling item in America's international accounts, coming before even gold shipments and 'changes in international bank accounts.' Every year sees additional foreign listings on our stock exchanges and additional American listings on foreign stock exchanges. This development makes possible a growing volume of security arbitrage. A fluctuation of one-fourth of 1 per cent in foreign exchange rates may cause (or prevent) a great volume of dealings by security arbitrageurs, whereas so slight a fluctuation may not move gold; thus current international indebtedness tends to be reduced or settled by security arbitrage before an impending gold movement gets started. There is certainly a tendency, even now, for the directions of security movements and of gold movements to coincide."

In effecting international settlements the transfer of gold coin or bullion is more expensive and difficult to effect and causes more disturbance in the international monetary system than does the transfer of credit, and, in turn, credit is more difficult and

less desirable to transfer than are securities. To facilitate the exchange of securities as a basis for effecting international settlements they should be listed on as many of the world's exchanges as possible. The Bank for International Settlements could perform a most constructive service by supplementing the gold pool by operating credit and securities pools with a view of still further facilitating the exchange of credits and securities between nations and thus lessen substantially the demands for gold.

#### GOLD-EXCHANGE ECONOMIES

Since 1925 many nations in returning to the gold basis were compelled to adopt the gold-exchange standard. The use of foreign exchange as a part of the firm cover reserve effected a great economy in the use of gold. Transactions with such nations involving the transfer of foreign exchange could be greatly facilitated if the Bank for International Settlements were to include foreign exchange under the administration of its gold pool, thereby effecting still further economies in the use of gold.

#### BROADER FUNCTIONS OF THE BANK FOR INTERNATIONAL SETTLEMENTS

The question as to whether the Bank for International Settlements has the authority under its charter to establish and operate foreign exchange, credit, and securities pools is well answered by Hon. George P. Auld, accountant general of the Reparation Commission, in an article published by the National Foreign Trade Council, from which the following is quoted:

"The objects of the bank, as stated in its charter, are 'to promote the cooperation of central banks and to provide additional facilities for international financial operations; and to act as trustee or agent in regard to international financial settlements intrusted to it under agreements with the parties concerned.' \* \* \* It is apparent from the report of the Young committee and subsequent expressions by individual members of it that they had a certain vision of a wide ultimate usefulness of the bank in the international centralization of reserves, the creation of a gold settlement fund, the development of world trade, and the stabilization of prices. \* \* \* Turning to the broader aspects of the bank's purposes and powers, we find that they include, in particular, the right to receive deposits from central banks and others and make deposits with central banks, to grant loans to or borrow from central banks on security, to discount or rediscount short-term obligations of prime liquidity, to make investments in negotiable securities, to buy and sell gold and exchange, and hold gold in custody for central banks."

In order to expedite readjustments in the distribution of gold, credits, and securities in providing greater equilibrium in the world's economic system, the Bank for International Settlements should act promptly in creating and operating credit and securities pools.

#### INDUSTRIAL CONSUMPTION EXPANDS

During the year of maximum inflation, 1920, the consumption of gold in the industrial arts in the United States reached the peak of over \$82,000,000, an amount in excess of domestic production of over \$31,000,000. In that year the industrial arts consumed not only \$51,000,000 of newly produced gold and \$28,000,000 in gold resulting from the melting of scrap, but also nearly \$3,000,000 of the monetary gold stock of the United States. The industrial consumption in 1926 amounted to over \$74,000,000 and only \$5,000,000 of the \$48,000,000 of newly produced gold in that year were available for monetary use. For the decade ending in 1929, after crediting the manufacturers with gold derived from scrap returned to the mint for refining, the amount of newly produced gold available for monetary use averaged annually only 12.5 million dollars. (See Table II.)

#### DOMESTIC PRODUCTION DECLINES

The production of gold in the United States of over \$101,000,000 was reached in 1915, and from this record point, as costs of production ascended to the peak of inflation in 1920, declined to \$51,000,000. Realizing that the industrial consumption was expanding as production was declining, leaving less gold available for monetary use and with the gold covers of the Federal reserve note and deposit liabilities of the Federal Reserve Bank declining to the minimums specified in the Federal reserve act, a legislative campaign was inaugurated in 1919 to remedy the situation.

A bill making an equitable adjustment was introduced in Congress providing that the industrial consumers pay to the producers of new gold in the United States 50 cents a pennyweight more than the mint price. As costs of production were far higher in 1919 and 1920 than 50 per cent above the 1913 level, this proposition was extremely fair to the industrial consumers, but it was realized that costs in the not distant future would decline and hence the amount was accepted by the producers as a minimum basis for keeping the industry alive during the crisis and thereby conserving the gold ore resources of the Nation.

#### ORE RESERVES WASTED

The deflation of 1921 began while this bill was being considered, and some of the gold producers were of the opinion that the operation of economic law had come to their rescue and that 1913 costs of production were then in sight and the industry would be restored to its normal basis. Under such circumstances action on the bill was not pressed.

Pre-war costs of production did not return as expected, and many mines which were being temporarily operated at a loss in anticipation of legislative relief were shut down, allowed to fill with water, timbers to rot, and ore to cave, and consequently the

Nation lost permanently a very substantial tonnage of its gold-ore reserve. Had this relief bill passed our gold-ore reserves would have been conserved and extended, production would have increased to a level commensurate with the Nation's position and prestige in the financial world, and the gold-mining industry today would be in a healthy condition and able to contribute a much greater amount of newly produced gold to the world's monetary stock. As it is, the production of gold in the United States declined in 1929 to less than \$44,000,000, with indications pointing to still lower levels in the future.

#### INDUSTRIAL RESTRICTIONS

The Director of the Mint, Hon. Robert J. Grant, in an article (Engineering and Mining Journal, February 8, 1930) on the gold situation in 1929, made the following statement: "It would not be surprising, however, if before many years steps are taken looking to the restriction of the amount of gold allowed to go into the arts."

There is no valid reason why humanity should suffer through the impaired operation of the gold standard by reducing monetary stocks to supply gold at pre-war prices to the manufacturers of articles largely for luxury consumption. Why should not the gold manufacturing industry stand on its own feet with all other industries and either produce its own gold or contract with producers for gold at prices which would justify continued operations? Governmental restrictions might become necessary, as the Director of the Mint indicates. However, it would be desirable and fair, before the adoption of such restrictions, to give the manufacturers an opportunity independently to provide for their own raw material, integrating production with fabrication, as have some of the principal copper producers done in order to protect and improve their economic position. Should the manufacturers of gold enter the field of production it would prove very helpful in expanding the world's gold output to meet industrial and monetary requirements.

#### INDUSTRIAL ECONOMIES

When the demand for gold articles was increasing so rapidly in 1919 and 1920 the manufacturers employed the lathe on a greater scale to speed up production. In using the lathe larger specimens of gold must be used than when worked by hand labor. It was explained at the time that it was cheaper to use more gold than to employ additional labor. Since it has become necessary to economize gold in the monetary system, there is again no valid reason why the lathe should not be replaced by hand labor, conserving gold in the industrial arts and giving employment to more artisans at a time when the need for reducing unemployment is a national problem.

#### THE ACCELERATION OF PRODUCTION

During the past decade, when gold mining was generally unprofitable, some of the leading gold dredging companies transferred their activities to the mining of tin, and the dredge is reported to have undergone some remarkable improvements, resulting in increased metal recoveries and reduced operating costs. Consequently, the modern dredge under favorable conditions could be operated profitably to-day on material which 10 years ago would not pay. Because of the economic pressure economies in mining and milling low-grade gold ores have been developed which, if applied more generally to other deposits of similar character, would add considerably to the world's gold output, as such operations to be successful necessarily must be conducted on a large tonnage basis. With a view to reducing costs of gold production, encouragements should be given to those who perfect improved and less expensive methods of mining and milling gold ores.

That ample capital and labor are now available on favorable terms to undertake new gold developments is emphasized in an editorial in the Engineering and Mining Journal of October 9, 1930, from which the following is quoted:

"Not in many decades have conditions been so propitious as they now are for intensive prospecting and development of gold-mining properties—for the production of the yellow metal on an increasing scale. Commodity prices are low. Labor is abundant. Highly efficient equipment is to be had at short notice and at a reasonable cost. Bank deposits have shown a steady increase this year, indicating the availability for investment of money at low rates. The favorable credit terms now obtaining are not likely to change in the near future."

It will, however, require initiative and enterprise to put new capital and labor to work. Regions which so far have not been well investigated should be included in any prospecting program with the older camps and better-known gold centers. The greater use of the airplane in observation and photographic mapping should expedite prospecting and geological reconnaissance work, especially in the remote regions. The best geological, mining, and metallurgical talent should be employed to direct such operations, as the available deposits will in large part be marginal in character and will require the greatest accuracy and experience to insure success. Then, too, there are some new discoveries coming to light all the time which are sufficiently high grade to attract capital. A reasonable activity along these lines should result in increasing world production by 1935 to such an extent as at least to offset the extensive declines in Transvaal production forecast to commence in that year. (See Table III.)

#### SALVAGE OPERATIONS

Some of the gold mines which have been shut down in recent years from which the high-grade ores have been extracted may be

in condition for reopening, retimbering, and otherwise available for the removal of the lower grades of ore which they still contain. The tailings from some milling operations in which cyanide is used as a solvent might pay to rework by more economical methods. The tailings from some placer operations might well be prospected to determine whether improved methods of handling the material would not be profitable. There is a large yardage of "pay dirt" in California tied up by an antidumping act. This law and any other restrictions of a similar character which obstruct gold operations should be promptly modified or repealed. Humanity's interests can be served best by maintaining the gold standard unimpaired, and the gold standard needs more newly produced gold.

#### FURTHER PRECAUTIONS

If given a satisfactory trial and these measures to economize in the monetary and industrial use of gold and in stimulating production do not prove sufficiently effective in supplying enough new gold to meet the increasing requirements of industry and trade, the Bank for International Settlements could contract with producers for gold to be recovered from gold-bearing material that can not be profitably mined under present economic conditions at the price of \$20.67 per ounce. No more profitable use of the earnings of the Bank for International Settlements could be made in the interest of its stockholders. From marginal gold ore deposits a substantial gold reserve for emergency use could be accumulated at small additional cost, and this would prove to be the least expensive and most effective method of averting gold crises and of maintaining international equilibrium in the operation of the gold standard.

#### SOVIET CURRENCY SYSTEM

The Soviet Government's currency system is unique, in that it is a pegged currency in all relations with foreign countries, all exchange transactions being under strict Government control. As a result, while the State Bank publishes regularly statements of the gold and other "firm cover" in the reserve, there is no indication given of the source from which increases are derived and, indeed, there is no assurance that the reserve exists.

Under normal circumstances, the increases in the volume of currency by continually larger issues of Treasury notes for which there is no direct backing, would inevitably tend, with only small increases in gold cover, to depreciate the currency to continually lower levels, approaching zero as a limit. With free traffic in Soviet rubles prevented, however, the Soviet Government has been able so far to maintain the value of the ruble at a par established by its own edict.

The fact is that the foreign currency reserve has actually little or no practical connection with the issue of currency, which is measured at the will of the Government. The inevitable result of this policy is a continuous increase in prices, even under the system of rationing and controlled rates now in force. As the figures for the purchasing power of the chervonetz are based, since October 1, 1929, on the controlled prices of socialized trade only, there is no indication of what its purchasing value would be in a free market. There is no free market in Russia, and even in the controlled market, the chervonetz is worth no more than one-half of its nominal value.

#### GOLD VALUE OF THE RUBLE

The currency in actual circulation in Russia consists of bank notes, treasury notes and subsidiary coin. Of the total bank notes issued a "firm cover" of at least 25 per cent is carried in the reserves. "Firm cover" is comprised principally of gold coin and bars, other precious metals (platinum and silver), foreign currency and drafts in foreign currency. No "firm cover" or other direct backing is required against the issue of treasury notes or subsidiary coin. Economic Survey, the official publication of the Soviet State Bank, gives the data for currency in circulation and "firm cover" which, on August 1, 1930, amounted to 3,860,000,000 and 539,000,000 rubles, respectively, indicating a "firm cover" of 14 per cent. As the gold par of the ruble is 51.46 cents, the ruble based on 14 per cent of "firm cover" would be worth about 7.2 gold cents. (See Table IV.)

Bank notes and treasury notes emitted by the Soviet Government are in larger amounts than the figures used above for currency in actual circulation. Had, therefore, the estimated value of the ruble been based on the actual emissions of notes, the value would be considerably less. Another liberality in this estimate lies in the fact that treasury notes on August 1, 1930, amounted to 1,533,000,000 of the total currency in actual circulation of 3,860,000,000 rubles, or nearly 40 per cent and 75 per cent of the total bank notes in circulation and treasury notes have no direct backing. The estimated value of the Soviet ruble on August 1, 1930, of 7.2 gold cents is, therefore, extremely liberal. The amount of bank notes in circulation increased in the 10 months from October 1, 1929, to August 1, 1930, from 1,428,000,000 to 2,054,000,000 rubles, or 43.8 per cent. The amount of treasury notes for the same period increased from 983,000,000 to 1,533,000,000 rubles, or 56 per cent. Since August 1, 1930, the amounts of bank notes and treasury notes emitted and in circulation have materially increased and the former ratio limiting the volume of treasury notes to 75 per cent of the volume of bank notes issued has been raised to a ratio of 1:1, and the bank statement of September 16, 1930, shows equal amounts of both. These note expansions, particularly that of the treasury-note issue since August 1, 1930, have still further reduced the gold value of the Soviet ruble.

#### SOVIET DUMPING

Under such unsound currency policies and delusive practices, products exported by the Soviet Government can be assumed to cost only a fraction of their nominal value; in fact, the Soviet Government actually pays nothing for its goods, since it issues at will the currency with which they are purchased, wages paid, transportation covered, etc. The Soviet Government makes no answer to this argument, since under its system it is simply a logical deduction.

#### SOVIET WHEAT

The cost of producing wheat in Russia is estimated by authorities to be 1.24 rubles per bushel. On the basis of the most liberal estimate of value of the ruble on August 1, 1930, of 7.2 gold cents, the cost of producing a bushel of wheat in Russia would be 8.9 gold cents. Ocean freight from Black Sea ports to Atlantic ports in Canada is not in excess of 15 gold cents per bushel. The 1930 tariff on wheat imported into the United States is 42 cents per bushel. From these estimated amounts Soviet wheat could be exported to the American market for 65.9 gold cents per bushel, leaving a considerable margin of gold profit at current market prices. Wheat spot firm No. 2 hard winter, f. o. b. New York, was quoted on October 20, 1930, at 90.1 cents per bushel. On the basis of this quotation, a profit of at least 24.2 gold cents would be made, which could either be kept here to pay for Soviet propaganda or returned to Russia, where it could be used for the emission of a flock of paper rubles. This is, indeed, a vicious circle in which inconvertible currency issued at will by the Soviet Government is the principal instrument used. While the Soviet can dump wheat here at a profit, it can make a greater profit by selling to near-by countries where the cost of transportation is much less, and thus replace American wheat in the European market.

#### SOVIET DUMPING WORLD-WIDE

The Soviet Government is dumping wheat and many more products into the markets of many countries. France had just harvested a corn crop when the Soviet dumped wheat into that country, destroying the corn market, and then, it is reported, communists tried to spread discontent among the corn growers. France has adopted a licensing system for Soviet imports and undoubtedly will vigorously enforce it. Canada has recently declared an embargo on Soviet coal, and many other nations will have to follow by adopting some protective measures to safeguard their industries from such unfair competition.

If the Soviet wants to experiment with unique and unsound economic theories, let that government confine the experiment within its own borders. The Soviet Government is violating the gold standard and its dumping program in many countries is dislocating trade and complicating an already serious situation. The very foundation of international finance is being undermined and the maintenance of the gold standard greatly menaced by the Soviet Government's external dumping operations, and the only remedy is complete economic isolation. The cost of foreign trade with Russia is too great if we consider the further dislocations of trade and gold resulting from the Soviet dumping program. The program outlined in this report for effecting economies in the monetary and industrial use of gold and for increasing gold production will prove ineffective at best if the Soviet industrialization program, coupled with inconvertible currency, is permitted to wreck industries in all countries, lower prices still further, lower standards of living, and increase the already large army of the unemployed.

#### PROMPT ACTION NECESSARY

Action by this Government must be prompt and decisive. Many other nations are waiting for the United States to assume the initiative and will join in establishing a wall of economic safety so that the Soviet will no longer be able to extend its unsound and spurious economic policies beyond its borders at the expense of humanity in general.

TABLE I.—*Net gold, credit, and securities items in the foreign trade of the United States,<sup>1</sup> 1923-1929*

(In millions of dollars)

Year	Gold <sup>2</sup>	Credit <sup>3</sup>	Securities <sup>4</sup>
1923.....	-295	+3	+30
1924.....	-216	+216	-733
1925.....	+102	-61	-569
1926.....	-72	+559	-540
1927.....	+154	.....	-695
1928.....	+272	-226	-708
1929.....	-120	+130	-386
Total.....	-175	+421	-3,592

<sup>1</sup> Compiled by H. N. Lawrie, from table on page 65—Bulletin No. 693, by Ray Hall, U. S. Department of Commerce.

<sup>2</sup> Gold shipped or earmarked (net).

<sup>3</sup> Change in net debt of American banks to foreigners.

<sup>4</sup> Net increase in long-term foreign investments in the United States, minus net increase in American long-term investments abroad (par value) from which bond discounts and underwriters' commissions have been deducted.

Paid items are those for which foreign countries have made payment to this country, and minus items are those for which the United States has made payment abroad.

TABLE II.—Industrial gold consumption exceeds production in the United States,<sup>1</sup> 1920-1929

(In thousands of dollars)

Year	A Total United States con- sumption in arts	B Total United States pro- duction from mines	A-B Excess United States con- sumption over pro- duction	C New gold consumed in United States arts	B-C New gold available for mone- tary use in United States
1920	\$82,215	\$51,187	\$31,028	\$54,010	-\$2,823
1921	50,674	50,067	607	23,050	+27,017
1922	50,806	48,849	10,957	36,322	+12,527
1923	69,292	51,734	17,553	40,013	+11,721
1924	65,888	52,277	13,611	37,913	+14,364
1925	65,954	49,860	16,094	36,162	+13,696
1926	74,334	48,270	26,064	43,268	+5,002
1927	59,319	45,419	13,900	32,858	+12,561
1928	59,081	46,165	12,916	31,570	+14,595
1929	<sup>2</sup> 59,404	43,990	15,414	<sup>2</sup> 27,373	+16,617
Average, 1920-1929	64,597	48,782	15,815	36,254	+12,528

<sup>1</sup> U. S. Mint figures to the nearest thousand.<sup>2</sup> Estimated by H. N. Lawrie.TABLE III.—Forecast estimates of world's gold production, non-monetary demand, and deficits of new monetary gold to provide 33 per cent cover if notes and sight liabilities increase 3 per cent per annum and if no economy in the use of gold is effected, 1930-1940<sup>1</sup>

(In millions of dollars)

Year	Esti- mated gold pro- duction	Non- mone- tary demand <sup>2</sup>	Avail- able for mone- tary purposes	Increments to gold reserves required to provide 33 per cent cover for 3 per cent average increase in notes and sight liabilities	Deficit of new mone- tary gold to provide 33 per cent cover if notes and sight li- abilities increase 3 per cent per annum
1930	404	180	224	253	-29
1931	402	182	220	260	-40
1932	410	184	226	269	-43
1933	407	186	221	276	-55
1934	403	188	215	285	-70
1935	398	190	208	294	-86
1936	397	192	205	302	-97
1937	392	194	198	311	-113
1938	384	196	188	321	-133
1939	370	198	172	330	-153
1940	370	200	170	340	-170

<sup>1</sup> Compiled by H. N. Lawrie from Table II, page 16, Interim Report of Gold Delegation of the Financial Committee of the League of Nations.<sup>2</sup> On the assumption that the nonmonetary demand for gold increases at the rate of 1 per cent per annum.TABLE IV.—Soviet currency in actual circulation, firm cover, and estimated gold value of ruble,<sup>1</sup> October 1, 1927, to August 1, 1930

(In millions of rubles)

	A Total currency in actual circula- tion <sup>2</sup>	B Firm cover	C Percent- age of firm cover <sup>4</sup>	D Gold value of ruble <sup>3</sup> in cent
Oct. 1, 1927	1,628.3	208.95	16.5	8.49
Oct. 1, 1928	1,970.8	279.52	14.2	7.31
Oct. 1, 1929	2,042.2	369.19	14.0	7.20
Nov. 1, 1929	2,833.6	395.58	14.0	7.20
Dec. 1, 1929	2,872.6	397.39	13.8	7.10
Jan. 1, 1930	2,773.0	388.16	14.0	7.20
Feb. 1, 1930	2,686.8	383.74	14.2	7.31
Mar. 1, 1930	2,803.8	388.95	13.9	7.15
Apr. 1, 1930	2,876.1	391.44	13.6	7.00
May 1, 1930	3,048.5	413.75	13.6	7.00
June 1, 1930	3,155.9	427.70	13.5	6.95
July 1, 1930	3,454.6	478.20	13.8	7.10
Aug. 1, 1930	3,860.2	530.32	14.0	7.20

<sup>1</sup> Compiled and computed by H. N. Lawrie, from Tables III and IV, p. 13, Economic Survey, State Bank of the U. S. S. R. for August, 1930.<sup>2</sup> Table IV, Total currency in actual circulation includes bank notes, Treasury notes and subsidiary coin.<sup>3</sup> Table III, Firm cover includes principally gold in coin and bars, other precious metals (platinum and silver), foreign currency and drafts in foreign currency.<sup>4</sup> Items in column B divided by corresponding items in column A.<sup>5</sup> Items in column C multiplied by ruble gold par of 51.46 cents.

ADDRESS ON THE SILVER SITUATION, BY H. N. LAWRIE, ECONOMIST, WASHINGTON, D. C., AND FORMERLY ECONOMIC ADVISER TO THE SENATE COMMISSION OF GOLD AND SILVER INQUIRY, BEFORE THE WASHINGTON SECTION OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF MINING AND METALLURGICAL ENGINEERS ON DECEMBER 18, 1930

Abyssinia and China are now the only remaining monetary strongholds of silver. The Occident is on a gold basis. India in 1926 adopted the gold bullion standard and Indo-China early in 1930 demonetized silver, thereby reducing the monetary demand for silver in the Orient and materially increasing the burden on the gold standard to supply an ever-expanding need for currency and credit. The effect of these changes in oriental monetary policies has been rendered more acute because of the dislocation of monetary gold reserves, which has been accentuated by soviet dumping operations. Furthermore, the gold standard is confronted with the prospect of a declining world gold production, which makes more necessary that silver should carry an ever-increasing rather than a decreasing share of the monetary burden of the world's credit and currency requirements.

## GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION

America produces over 85 per cent and consumes about 15 per cent of the world's total silver. The world's silver production in 1928 amounted to 257,000,000 ounces, of which Mexico contributed 42 per cent, the United States 23 per cent, Canada 9 per cent, Peru 9 per cent, Australia 4 per cent, India 3 per cent, and other countries 10 per cent. Countries outside of America, principally China and India, consume 85 per cent of the world's production.

## SILVER DEPRESSION

Half of the world's population in the Occident with substantial gold reserves is largely dependent on the normal functioning of the gold standard, while the other half in the Orient, with its large silver reserves, is as greatly dependent for its prosperity on the value of silver. When the average price of silver in 1929 of 53.3 cents declined to a new low of 30.75 cents per ounce on December 30, 1930, a decline of more than 22 cents per ounce, or 42.3 per cent, the potential purchasing power of half of the world's population was seriously depreciated. That this marked decline in the price of silver has contributed materially to lowering world commodity prices and to the present economic depression there can be no doubt. It is, therefore, important to determine the causes for this heavy decline in the price of silver and to provide a remedy if the problems involved in the present world-wide economic depression are to be solved. Let us examine some of the principal causes for the decline in the price of silver.

## COINAGE DEBASEMENT

The price of silver early in 1920 reached a high point of \$1.40 per ounce, and at that price it was profitable to melt the silver currencies then in circulation and to sell the recovered bullion. This is one of the most serious factors, undermining the monetary position of silver and causing so extensive a decline in the price of the white metal. In addition to an increasing output of newly mined silver, the world has had to absorb tons of metal resulting from the debasement of silver currencies or their complete displacement by coinages of other metals, such as aluminum, nickel, and copper. When these surplus amounts of bullion recovered from debased or demonetized silver coinages were marketed in the centers where the greatest demands existed, in India and China, the effect was more rapidly to limit the capacities of these countries to absorb silver.

Great Britain in 1920 reduced the fineness of her silver coinage from 925 to 500 fine, thereby dumping tons of metal on the already weak markets of Bombay and Shanghai. Mexico in September, 1921, reduced the weight and fineness of her "peso fuerte" and of her fractional currency, and the tons of silver released reduced the price of silver, creating unemployment in her own silver mines, and all for a slight seigniorage profit. Indo-China, a French empire, adopted the gold bullion standard early in 1930 and sold a large quantity of silver plasters on the market in a very short time, contributing to the extent and rapidity of the decline in the price of silver. These are but a few of the instances where debasement of silver coinage adversely affected the market.

The silver policy of India since 1926, when the gold bullion standard was adopted, has resulted in the sale of about 83,000,000 ounces by the Government. The prospect of large silver sales from the Government reserve, estimated at 412,000,000 ounces, of which at least one-half is for sale, has had a most serious and depressing effect on the market. The psychological influence of impending sales has at times been more damaging than the sales themselves, and right now this "Sword of Damocles" hangs heavily over silver prices.

## INDIA'S WEALTH SHRINKS

The total number of rupees coined in India from 1835 to 1922 was 6,475,000,000, which at 165 grains of fine silver per rupee amounts to about 2,226,000,000 fine ounces. There has been practically no silver coined since 1922. Prior to 1835 large quantities of silver coins were put into circulation and the above figures also exclude a large coinage of half-rupee coins. Taking these coinages into account and the net silver imports into India for private account, it is conservatively estimated that the silver reserves in India amount to no less than 5,000,000,000 ounces, representing more than one-third of the world's output since the dis-

covery of America. About one-half of the total reserve was minted into coins, of which 1,200,000,000 1-rupee coins, or about 16 per cent, are now held in Government reserves, the remaining 84 per cent being in circulation or hoarding. The 2,500,000,000 ounces which can not be accounted for by minting are in the form of hoarded jewelry or bars.

The silver reserves of India, 5,000,000,000 ounces, were in 1929, at 53.3 cents per ounce, worth \$2,665,000,000, and were on December 30, 1930, at 30.75 cents per ounce, worth only \$1,537,500,000, a decline of over \$1,000,000,000. When the wealth of a country rapidly shrinks over 42 per cent in value the extent of its effect on the present world depression can be better appreciated.

#### INDIA'S ABSORPTIVE CAPACITY

Another adverse effect of the high war and postwar prices of silver was the destruction of a large amount of the rupee coinage of India. It pays to melt rupee coins and to sell the recovered bullion when the price of silver exceeds 110 rupees per 100 tolas; and regardless of a law prohibiting the destruction of coin, it is estimated that some 200,000,000 ounces of silver bullion reached the Indian market from this source. While this silver did not leave India, it had the effect of limiting the absorptive capacity of that country, thus contributing to the weakness of the silver market in subsequent years.

The Indian authorities at the time of the marked decline in the price of silver early in 1930 imposed an import duty of about 9 cents an ounce on the white metal. Some experts, under the depressed conditions, voiced the opinion that this duty would result in stopping imports altogether. This forecast was supported further by the fact that the Indian Government had a considerable quantity of silver which it desired to sell on the protected market. The net imports of silver into India in the first eight months of 1930 amounted to 71,772,700 ounces, compared with 50,391,800 ounces during the whole of 1929. Therefore, contrary to forecasts, India has absorbed more silver under the duty than for the period when silver was on the free list.

#### INDIA STILL HOARDS SILVER

Furthermore, there are some experts who anticipated that low prices would bring silver out of hoarding. This prediction was based on the silver which was being sent from the up-country districts to Bombay. This silver was in the form of rupee coins which have a value of 1s. 6d., or 36 gold cents, which can be exchanged for more than an ounce of silver at present price levels, or three times as much bullion as is contained (about one-third of an ounce) in the rupee. The farmers, therefore, are obtaining much more silver by the exchange of rupee coins for bullion, and this demonstrates an increasing up-country demand for silver and not a desire to dispose of silver at low prices. The forecast that India would dump silver at present low price levels is, therefore, erroneous.

#### CHINA'S WEALTH SHRINKS

The silver reserves of China are estimated at 3,000,000,000 ounces, of which over 1,000,000,000 ounces was the net import of silver for the 30 years 1901-1930, and the remainder was brought into the country during the 300 preceding years. An authority on Chinese currency, E. Kann (Finance and Commerce, June 18, 1930), estimated that the mintage of silver dollars and subsidiary coins since 1891 has a face value of about \$2,200,000,000, which, at the rate of 374 grains of fine silver to the dollar, would amount to about 1,700,000,000 fine ounces. The same authority estimates a visible supply of silver in sycee of about 200,000,000 ounces. Foreign silver coins, which formerly had a large circulation in China, such as the Mexican, British, and Saigen dollars, are now being rapidly eliminated, so that 100,000,000 ounces would probably be a close estimate of their silver content. This makes a total of 2,000,000,000 ounces accounted for and 1,000,000,000 ounces still hoarded in the form of jewelry or bullion.

The silver reserves of China of 3,000,000,000 ounces were worth \$1,599,000,000 in 1929, when the average price of silver was 53.3 cents per fine ounce, and on December 30, 1930, when the price dropped to 30.75 cents per ounce, were worth only \$922,500,000, a decline of \$677,000,000, or over 42 per cent. Undoubtedly, this rapid shrinkage of China's wealth has contributed in no small degree to the present economic depression. It is in the broad interest of the Occident as well as of the Orient to expedite, if possible, the return of China's wealth and potential purchasing power to a more normal condition.

#### CHINESE CURRENCY

Stocks of silver at Shanghai increased from 107,900,000 ounces on January 1, 1928, to 147,200,000 ounces on January 1, 1929, to 192,400,000 ounces on January 1, 1930, and to 217,800,000 ounces on October 25, 1930. Civil war in China, made more intensive by the soviet, not only has lessened the country's productive capacity and retarded or prevented the movement of commodities from the interior to the treaty ports where they could be exported but also has made the outlying districts, or up-country, so unsafe that the people have been compelled to bring silver to the Shanghai banks, where better protection was afforded.

In lieu of the silver being removed from circulation and concentrated in the bank reserves in the treaty ports, large volumes of paper currency were issued, principally by Chinese banks. Notwithstanding the large silver reserves in Shanghai, there is not

enough to supply one-half of the silver legally required as a backing for these notes. Furthermore, subsidiary silver currency has become greatly depreciated through its debasement and its lack of uniform weight and fineness. To complicate business further, the rates at which different coins circulate change from day to day.

#### REFORMS NOW POSSIBLE

With the successful drives made against the red rebels recently by General Chiang-Kai-Shek, it is reported that conditions even in the remote sections of China have again been restored to safety so that silver coin could now be distributed generally throughout the country without undue risk. The new mint has been completed and is in readiness to operate. Under these circumstances nothing would be more helpful to silver than a large minting of silver coins of high silver content and minting accuracy principally of the smaller denominations of 10 and 20 cent pieces, to be generally circulated in the remote districts. This would result in the decentralizing of the silver reserves of Shanghai and China would again enter the silver market as an active buyer.

It would, therefore, be an error to assume that China has too much silver or that silver will be brought out of hoarding at present low prices. With civil war at an end, with transportation restored to normal conditions, with currency reform, and a refunding of national debts, China's productive capacity will greatly increase, her export position strengthen, and her capacity to absorb silver will be substantially increased. In such reforms China should be accorded the sympathetic consideration of other nations and supported by the extension of additional loans in her war against the soviet menace if the Orient is to contribute its full share to the solution of the present world depression.

#### CURRENCY POLICY CHANGES

No one will question the desirability of improving the silver situation, thereby elevating the standard of living of half of the world's population and restoring more normal conditions of international trade. There are a number of constructive things which might be done to relieve the present acute situation. The rate of 18 pence adopted for rupee exchange in 1926 has proven very burdensome to India to maintain, and silver has been sold to develop gold credits to meet these obligations. Under such circumstances it would be helpful if the rupee gold parity were to be substantially reduced in the not distant future. Such a change in policy would make less necessary, or perhaps unnecessary, the sale of large quantities of silver on the present greatly depressed market. The lifting of the duty on the importation of silver into India would also prove beneficial.

Great Britain also has much to gain through a reminting of her silver coinage on the former basis of 925 fine. The effect of this would be to improve the silver situation, increase the power of India to absorb cotton goods, and lessen the number of unemployed cotton-mill workers in England.

Mexico might well consider the reminting of silver coinage on the weight and fineness of the old "peso fuerte," foregoing a seigniorage profit, but aiding in maintaining operation of her silver mines with additional tax revenues. Mexico could then also lift the embargoes on the importation of silver coins and the exportation of gold, which constitute artificial barriers to the return of more normal conditions.

Now that the coinage of plasters has been largely sold by Indo-China, the Chinese embargo on the importation of silver coins and the exportation of gold could be lifted with excellent effect.

In order to meet an acute situation in India during the World War, Great Britain came to the United States, the only country able to supply the demand from monetary silver reserves, and negotiated a purchase of the metals, copper and silver, contained in 350,000,000 dollar pieces. The silver contained in some 260,000,000 dollar pieces, in accordance with the provisions of the Pittman Act, was delivered to the British Government, and the crisis in India was met. This illustrates the importance of holding large silver reserves in this country, immediately available to meet world emergencies.

There is now an unparalleled international competition for gold and a real need for more gold under the present dislocation of reserves, accentuated by Soviet dumping operations. The gold in this country is, under our flexible banking system, doing an increasing amount of the world's financing, as well as our own, and the criticism that much of the large gold reserve in the United States is sterile is not well founded. Nevertheless, this country, by increasing its silver reserves and expanding its silver-currency circulation, could contract correspondingly its gold-certificate circulation and release this gold for more constructive use in aiding foreign currency reforms and thereby assist in the maintenance of the gold standard. The enlarged silver reserves, as in the case of the last war, might again contribute to national security, and if the United States were now to enter the market on a substantial basis it would react very favorably on the price of silver.

#### BIMETALLISM NO SOLUTION

Suggestions have been made that a definite price for silver be internationally adopted, establishing a fixed silver-to-gold ratio. When a figure of so many cents per ounce is suggested, a controversy arises as to whether it would be too low under certain economic conditions to sustain production on a scale commen-

surate with the need or, on the other hand, would be so high under other economic conditions as to result in overproduction. Both conditions would be undesirable and the opposition to bimetallism would be so great as to prevent its acceptance.

#### ASSOCIATED METALS

Silver is an important source of revenue in the production of other metals. Silver bearing ores from which 91 per cent (data from Economic Paper No. 10, United States Bureau of Mines) of the world's silver is produced, also yield 85 per cent of the world's gold, 69 per cent of the world's lead, 66 per cent of the world's copper, and 46 per cent of the world's zinc production. The metals produced annually from these ores are valued at over a billion dollars, of which silver contributes over a hundred million dollars, or 10.4 per cent. This complex relationship of silver and other metals indicates how intimately it is associated with them in an economic sense.

#### SILVER PRICES UNECONOMIC

The price of silver enters into the production of gold, copper, lead and zinc. A high price for the white metal, other conditions being the same, would without any increase in the demand largely stimulate the production of copper, lead and zinc, with which it is associated. On the other hand, increasing demands or high prices for copper, lead, and zinc would stimulate silver production even though the demand or price for silver had not increased, or may even have decreased. The law of supply and demand, therefore, does not operate in the cases of silver, copper, lead, or zinc as it does with commodities which constitute the only source of revenue to the respective industries producing them. This fact not only justifies but makes necessary the adoption of a price adjustment for silver which would reflect the supply and demand for copper, lead, and zinc.

#### BASE-METAL BURDENS

Silver prices at present low levels, if continued over a considerable period, undoubtedly will lessen the production of copper, lead, and zinc, resulting ultimately in increasing permanently the prices of these metals. Since copper, lead, and zinc are generally used in the world's economy it is undesirable that their price levels should be raised in order to make up for the deficiency resulting from extremely low silver price levels. It would seem more constructive to adopt some plan to restore silver to more normal price levels, so that it would not be necessary permanently to elevate the prices of copper, lead, and zinc.

#### SCIENTIFIC PRICE ADJUSTMENT

It has become necessary in the present crisis to consider an improved international status for silver with greater price stability. A scientific plan would be the adoption of an arbitrary price of say 50 cents per ounce to be readjusted every month by dividing it by the composite copper, lead, and zinc price index, based on the composite base-metal price average for the years 1922, 1923, and 1924 equaling 100. The years 1922, 1923, and 1924, because they represent a period of stability in the prices of the non-ferrous metals, have been accepted and generally used as a basis for determining metal price indexes in the years since 1924. The price of silver under such a plan would vary from month to month and would rise above 50 cents per ounce when the composite average copper-lead-zinc price declined below 9 cents per composite pound, and vice versa.

The result would be to stabilize revenues to copper, lead, zinc, and silver operators and thereby tend to stabilize the production of these metals. With greater uniformity in the monthly production of silver, copper, lead, and zinc would come greater stability in their prices. Since the silver to gold ratio would vary from month to month and on a basis that only the economic situation could determine, this proposal differs materially from bimetallism. A fixed price for silver or bimetallism would accentuate the difficulties with which not only silver but also copper, lead, and zinc are now confronted, and instead of tending to stabilize the prices of all of these metals would, in fact, create greater instability than now exists.

#### GREATER PRICE STABILITY

Actual New York monthly average silver prices and silver prices based on 50 cents per fine ounce, adjusted to composite monthly indexes for copper, lead, and zinc, combined on the basis of the average price of copper, lead, and zinc for the years 1922, 1923, and 1924 (9 cents per composite pound=100), are presented in Table III. It will be noted that during the period 1925-1930, inclusive, actual monthly average silver prices fluctuated from the high price of 71.570 cents per ounce in September, 1925, to 32.635 cents per ounce in December, 1930, a difference of nearly 39 cents, while the monthly average silver prices adjusted to the base-metal indexes vary from a maximum of 71.736 cents per ounce to a minimum of 40.486 cents per ounce, a difference of only 31 cents. Eliminating the eccentric year of 1930 from the period the maximum variation of actual monthly average silver prices was 23 cents per ounce and of silver prices adjusted to the base-metal indexes was less than 16 cents per ounce. In both instances the variation of silver prices adjusted to the base-metal index was less than the variation of actual silver prices recorded.

Had this plan been in effect in 1925 the adjustment in the price of silver from month to month would undoubtedly have operated to stabilize the prices of silver, copper, lead, and zinc, and the price variations would, therefore, have been much less. If the

plan had been in operation the production of copper, lead, and zinc in 1928 and 1929 would probably have been less, and consequently, the production of silver would also have been less, relieving to a considerable degree the pressure on the silver market in absorbing the record world's outputs of silver in 1928 and 1929, which resulted in still further depressing the price of the white metal.

#### INCREASED MONETARY DEMANDS

There is no question that the rapidly declining price for silver has rendered the metal almost if not entirely unsuitable for bank reserves, greatly diminishing the monetary demands for the metal. A higher price for silver during periods of world depression would be a great aid in maintaining an active oriental trade, thus stabilizing international trade. Greater stability in the price of silver is also an important monetary and trade consideration. If this proposal were adopted, an increased demand for silver for use in bank reserves would develop. Furthermore, under this proposal, the price of silver could never go so high as to make profitable the melting of silver coinages, even if minted on the old high standards of fineness, and consequently, silver currencies in circulation would be protected and one of the most serious obstacles to the monetary use of silver would be removed.

#### SERIOUS CONSEQUENCES

Should discussion of this proposal to readjust the price of silver be favorable, this country might well assume the initiative in corresponding with the principal countries affected. There is no necessity for a time-consuming international conference, but such a correspondence to obtain the views and cooperation of other nations might well result in quickly establishing a scientific world silver reform which would greatly aid in reestablishing more normal international trade and assist in strengthening and maintaining the gold standard by lessening the strain on gold and in meeting most effectively the soviet attacks in Africa and the Orient. Unless prompt action is taken to determine a solution of the silver problem and to establish economic isolation for Soviet Russia, the communistic efforts, through dumping commodities produced by convict, forced, or indentured labor or by fiat currency to undermine the gold and silver standards, the foundations of the world's currency and financial systems, will result in still more serious consequences, of prolonged and more intense economic depression and further world-wide unemployment.

TABLE I.—Monthly average prices of copper, lead, and zinc<sup>1</sup>  
(Cents per pound)

COPPER						
Month	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929	1930
January.....	14.709	13.822	12.990	13.854	16.603	17.775
February.....	14.463	13.999	12.682	13.823	17.727	17.775
March.....	14.004	13.859	13.079	13.845	21.257	17.775
April.....	13.252	13.706	12.808	13.986	19.500	15.621
May.....	13.347	13.599	12.621	14.293	17.775	12.756
June.....	13.399	13.655	12.370	14.527	17.775	12.049
July.....	13.946	13.924	12.532	14.527	17.775	11.023
August.....	14.490	14.174	12.971	14.526	17.775	10.693
September.....	14.376	14.062	12.940	14.724	17.775	10.310
October.....	14.300	13.862	12.953	15.202	17.775	9.597
November.....	14.353	13.576	13.319	15.778	17.775	10.113
December.....	13.866	13.302	13.774	15.844	17.775	10.300

LEAD						
January.....	10.169	9.255	7.577	6.500	6.650	6.250
February.....	9.428	9.154	7.420	6.329	6.853	6.236
March.....	8.914	8.886	7.577	6.000	7.450	5.662
April.....	8.005	7.971	7.126	6.100	7.187	5.537
May.....	7.985	7.751	6.616	6.123	7.000	5.523
June.....	8.321	8.033	6.414	6.300	7.000	5.410
July.....	8.151	8.499	6.344	6.220	6.804	5.250
August.....	9.192	8.908	6.681	6.248	6.750	5.488
September.....	9.508	8.786	6.297	6.450	6.890	5.600
October.....	9.513	8.402	6.250	6.500	6.873	5.151
November.....	9.739	8.005	6.250	6.389	6.285	5.100
December.....	9.310	7.855	6.504	6.495	6.250	5.100

ZINC						
January.....	7.733	8.304	6.661	5.643	6.350	5.229
February.....	7.480	7.759	6.673	5.551	6.350	5.180
March.....	7.319	7.332	6.692	5.624	6.463	4.934
April.....	6.985	7.001	6.338	5.759	6.658	4.843
May.....	6.951	6.821	6.075	6.026	6.618	4.641
June.....	6.900	7.112	6.213	6.158	6.686	4.441
July.....	7.208	7.411	6.229	6.201	6.766	4.350
August.....	7.578	7.376	6.342	6.249	6.800	4.360
September.....	7.753	7.413	6.212	6.250	6.799	4.279
October.....	8.282	7.296	5.996	6.250	6.740	4.059
November.....	8.614	7.199	5.745	6.263	6.242	4.266
December.....	8.565	7.018	5.722	6.349	5.666	4.099

<sup>1</sup> Engineering and Mining Journal prices of copper and lead at New York, zinc at St. Louis.

Compiled by H. N. Lawrie.

TABLE II.—Composite monthly price index of average combined prices of copper, lead, and zinc, based on average combined prices for 1922, 1923, and 1924, 9 cents per pound=100

Month	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929	1930
January	120.8	116.2	100.8	96.3	109.6	108.3
February	116.2	114.5	99.2	95.2	114.6	108.1
March	112.0	109.6	101.3	94.3	130.3	105.1
April	104.6	106.2	97.3	95.7	123.5	96.3
May	104.8	104.3	93.7	97.6	116.3	84.9
June	106.3	106.7	92.6	99.9	116.5	81.1
July	108.5	110.5	93.0	99.8	116.1	76.4
August	115.8	112.8	96.3	100.1	116.0	76.1
September	117.2	112.1	94.3	101.6	116.5	74.4
October	118.9	109.5	93.3	103.5	116.3	69.7
November	121.1	106.6	93.8	105.3	112.2	72.1
December	117.6	104.4	96.3	106.3	110.0	72.2

Compiled and computed by H. N. Lawrie.

TABLE III.—Actual silver prices<sup>1</sup>  
(Cents per fine ounce)

Month	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929	1930
January	68.447	67.795	55.795	57.135	57.019	45.000
February	68.472	66.773	57.898	57.016	56.210	43.193
March	67.808	65.880	55.306	57.245	56.346	41.654
April	66.899	64.409	56.399	57.395	55.668	42.428
May	67.580	65.075	56.280	60.298	54.125	40.736
June	69.106	65.481	56.769	60.019	52.415	34.595
July	69.442	64.793	56.360	59.215	52.510	34.346
August	70.240	62.380	54.718	58.880	52.579	35.192
September	71.570	60.580	55.445	57.536	51.042	36.315
October	71.106	54.505	56.035	58.087	49.913	35.846
November	69.223	54.141	57.474	57.953	49.615	35.908
December	68.889	53.466	57.957	57.335	48.475	32.635

<sup>1</sup>Engineering and Mining Journal, New York silver prices.

Silver prices, based on 50 cents per fine ounce prior to 1925, and adjusted to composite monthly base metal index (Table II)  
(Cents per fine ounce)

Month	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929	1930
January	41.391	43.029	49.603	51.921	45.620	46.168
February	43.029	43.668	50.403	52.521	43.630	46.253
March	44.643	45.620	49.358	53.022	38.373	47.574
April	47.801	47.081	51.387	52.247	40.486	51.921
May	47.710	47.939	53.262	51.230	42.992	58.893
June	47.037	46.860	53.996	50.050	42.918	61.652
July	46.083	45.249	53.763	50.100	43.066	65.445
August	43.178	44.326	51.921	49.950	43.103	65.703
September	42.662	44.603	53.022	49.702	42.918	67.204
October	42.052	45.662	53.591	48.309	42.992	71.736
November	41.288	46.904	53.305	47.483	44.563	69.348
December	42.517	47.893	51.921	47.037	45.455	69.252

Compiled and computed by H. N. Lawrie.

#### WITHDRAWAL OF PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, I have three letters from the Secretary of the Interior to the President, one dated December 18, 1928, another December 10, 1929, and a third December 9, 1930, each transmitting a report of withdrawals of public lands made during the year to which it relates. I ask unanimous consent that the letters and the reports be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters and reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,  
Washington, December 18, 1928.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

Sir: The act of Congress entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to make withdrawals of public lands in certain cases," approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847), provides, among other things, that the Secretary of the Interior shall report all such withdrawals to Congress at the beginning of its next regular session after the date of the withdrawal.

In compliance with the requirements of the statute I have the honor to inclose herewith copy of a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office dated December 15, 1928, transmitting report of the withdrawals and restorations contemplated by the statute.

Very truly yours,

ROY O. WEST.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
GENERAL LAND OFFICE,  
Washington, December 15, 1928.

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Sir: Under section 3, act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847), the Secretary of the Interior is required to report to Congress all withdrawals made under said act at the beginning of its next regular session after the date of withdrawal. To that end I transmit a report, in sextuple, showing the withdrawals and restorations made under said act through this office, including those made on recommendation of the Director of the Geological Survey,

during the period beginning December 1, 1927, and ending November 30, 1928. The report also shows areas embraced in outstanding withdrawals at the latter date.

Very respectfully,

WILLIAM SPRY, Commissioner.

Withdrawals and restorations under act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847), during period December 1, 1927, to November 30, 1928, inclusive

State and class of action	Outstanding withdrawn Dec. 1, 1927	Period Dec. 1, 1927, to Nov. 30, 1928		Outstanding withdrawn Nov. 30, 1928
		With-drawn	Restored	
<b>Alabama:</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b>Acres</b>
Aid legislation	575			575
Classification				
Do.				
Do.	2,440			2,440
Recreational purposes	1,625			1,625
Power sites	120			120
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,760</b>			<b>4,760</b>
<b>Alaska:</b>				
Administrative sites	70			70
Agricultural experiment station	40	280		320
Biological survey	480			480
Bureau of fisheries	160			160
Classification	230,006			230,006
Cemetery purposes	10			10
Military reservation	3			3
Lighthouse	640			640
National-park purposes	2,480			2,480
Power sites	93,415			93,415
Road commission	2			2
Tanakee Hot Springs				
Town-site purposes	420	114	534	
<b>Total</b>	<b>327,726</b>	<b>394</b>	<b>534</b>	<b>327,586</b>
<b>Arizona:</b>				
Administrative sites	684			684
Aid of legislation	2,560			2,560
Army airplane field	40			40
Agricultural experiment station	10,651			10,651
Classification	104,127			104,127
Coal	139,415			139,415
Mineral	8,507			8,507
National Guard rifle range		400		400
National park	67			67
Pending resurvey	15,590	58,554	10,870	63,274
Petroleum	92,496			92,496
Public park	15,080			15,080
Power sites	433,034			433,034
Public waters	18,915	1,345	30	20,230
Stock driveways	329,450			329,450
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,170,616</b>	<b>60,299</b>	<b>10,900</b>	<b>1,220,015</b>
<b>Arkansas:</b>				
Classification	400			400
Power sites	22,354		360	21,994
<b>Total</b>	<b>22,754</b>		<b>360</b>	<b>22,394</b>
<b>California:</b>				
Aid of legislation	604,162	80		604,242
Air mail beacon sites and landing fields	2,680			2,680
Ammunition depot, U. S. Navy			(5)	
Camp-site purposes	20			20
Classification	55,957		1,310	54,647
Coal	17,603			17,603
Forest administrative sites	1,199			1,199
Harbor development	3			3
Lighthouse	8			8
Pending resurvey	25,115		13,091	12,024
Petroleum	1,178,392			1,178,392
Potash	90,638			90,638
Power sites	291,113		457	290,656
Protect hot springs		320		320
Public waters	167,496	20,200	8	187,638
Reservoir sites	1,160	920		2,030
Town-site purposes	120			120
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,435,666</b>	<b>21,520</b>	<b>14,866</b>	<b>2,442,320</b>
<b>Colorado:</b>				
Administrative sites	302			302
Aid of legislation	16,493			16,493
Classification	573,178			573,178
Coal	4,180,201		37,863	4,142,338
National-monument purposes	65			65
Naval oil shale	43,860			43,860
Petroleum	218,997			218,997
Pending resurvey	322,577	125,550	36,988	411,139
Power sites	225,769	32	160	225,641
Proposed monument	320			320
Public waters	2,388	2,640		5,028
Reservoir sites	102,460			102,460
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,686,610</b>	<b>128,222</b>	<b>75,011</b>	<b>5,739,821</b>
<b>Florida:</b>				
Adjustment equitable rights	500			500
Administrative sites	40			40
Classification				
Do.				
Do.	222			222
Naval purposes				
Pending legislation	468			468
Phosphate	68,641		1,520	67,121
<b>Total</b>	<b>69,871</b>		<b>1,520</b>	<b>68,351</b>

Footnotes at end of table.

Withdrawals and restorations under act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847), during period December 1, 1927, to November 30, 1928, inclusive—Continued

State and class of action	Outstanding with- drawn Dec. 1, 1927	Period Dec. 1, 1927, to Nov. 30, 1928		Out- standing with- drawn Nov. 30, 1928
		With- drawn	Restored	
<b>Idaho:</b>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>
Administrative sites.....	2,352	96		2,448
Aid of legislation.....	55,140		3,300	51,840
Classification.....	80,628			80,628
Coal.....	4,761			4,761
Experimental station.....	28,427			28,427
National Guard rifle range.....	320			320
Phosphate.....	652,864			652,864
Power sites.....	201,694			201,694
Public waters.....	13,345	560		13,905
Reservoir sites.....	26,240			26,240
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>1,065,771</b>	<b>656</b>	<b>3,300</b>	<b>1,063,127</b>
<b>Louisiana:</b>				
Aid of legislation.....	105			105
Petroleum.....	466,990			466,990
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>467,095</b>			<b>467,095</b>
<b>Michigan:</b>				
Aid of legislation.....				
Do.....	1,028			1,028
Classification.....		3,871		3,871
Power sites.....	1,240			1,240
Proposed monument.....	7,347			7,347
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>9,615</b>	<b>3,871</b>		<b>13,486</b>
<b>Minnesota:</b>				
Aid of legislation.....		26,800		26,800
Classification.....	373			373
Power sites.....	12,309			12,309
Regulate level Lake of the Woods.....	11,402			11,402
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>24,084</b>	<b>26,800</b>		<b>50,884</b>
<b>Mississippi, classification.....</b>				
<b>Montana:</b>				
Administrative sites.....	6,326			6,326
Agricultural field station.....		200		200
Aid of legislation.....	1,134			1,134
Classification.....	236,270			236,270
Coal.....	7,835,574		19,223	7,816,351
Forest administrative sites.....	752			752
Petroleum.....	1,344,640			1,344,640
Phosphate.....	279,904			279,904
Power sites.....	127,772			127,772
Public waters.....	8,036	280		8,316
Reservoir sites.....	9,080			9,080
Sheep experimental station.....	15,776			15,776
Well-drilling reserve.....	40			40
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>9,865,324</b>	<b>480</b>	<b>19,223</b>	<b>9,846,581</b>
<b>Nebraska:</b>				
Administrative sites.....	39			39
Power sites.....	761			761
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>800</b>			<b>800</b>
<b>Nevada:</b>				
Administrative sites.....	534			534
Aid of legislation.....	85,760			85,760
Air mail beacon sites and landing field.....	680			680
Classification.....	29,080			29,080
Coal.....	83,603			83,603
Oil shale.....	123			123
Navy ammunition depot.....	125,724			125,724
Potash.....	39,492			39,492
Power sites.....	27,492			27,492
Public waters.....	9,645	1,700		11,345
Well-drilling reserves.....	80			80
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>402,214</b>	<b>1,700</b>		<b>403,914</b>
<b>New Mexico:</b>				
Administrative sites.....	593			593
Airplane landing field.....	160			160
Coal.....	5,113,294			5,113,294
Experimental station.....	192,872			192,872
Military purposes.....	52,480			52,480
National Guard target ranges.....	620			620
National-monument purposes.....	82,330	2,560		84,890
Pending resurvey.....	368,286	224,498	97,592	495,192
Potash.....	7,418,437			7,418,437
Power sites.....	61,449			61,449
Public waters.....	9,811			9,811
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>13,300,332</b>	<b>227,058</b>	<b>97,592</b>	<b>13,429,798</b>
<b>North Dakota:</b>				
Coal.....	6,192,486			6,192,486
Petroleum.....	84,894			84,894
Reservoir sites.....	478			478
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>6,277,858</b>			<b>6,277,858</b>

Footnotes at end of table.

Withdrawals and restorations under act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847), during period December 1, 1927, to November 30, 1928, inclusive—Continued

State and class of action	Outstanding with- drawn Dec. 1, 1927	Period Dec. 1, 1927, to Nov. 30, 1928		Out- standing with- drawn Nov. 30, 1928
		With- drawn	Restored	
<b>Oregon:</b>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>
Administrative sites.....	807	32		839
Aid of legislation.....	27,921		160	27,761
Classification.....	1,348,462		4,380	1,344,082
Coal.....	4,361			4,361
Lookout station.....		40		40
Pending resurvey.....	6,200			6,200
Power sites.....	382,179	243	3,444	378,978
Public waters.....	20,801	680		21,481
Recreational or bird refuge.....				
Reservoir sites.....	18,603			18,603
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>1,809,334</b>	<b>995</b>	<b>7,984</b>	<b>1,802,345</b>
<b>South Dakota:</b>				
Administrative sites.....	321			321
Aid of legislation.....	37,560		320	37,240
Protect water supply.....	480			480
Public waters.....	240			240
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>38,601</b>		<b>320</b>	<b>38,281</b>
<b>Utah:</b>				
Administrative sites.....	360			360
Aid of legislation.....	3,201	260		3,461
Adjust claims.....				
Classification.....	12,370	30,199		42,569
Coal.....	3,975,353			3,975,353
Helium.....	7,100			7,100
National-monument purposes.....	160			160
National-park purposes.....	6,400	6,400		12,800
Naval oil shale.....	91,464			91,464
Pending resurvey.....	50,289		23,112	27,177
Petroleum.....	985,550			985,550
Phosphate.....	301,945			301,945
Power sites.....	441,304			441,304
Public waters.....	34,286	1,735	80	35,941
Reservoirs.....	26,040			26,040
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>5,935,822</b>	<b>38,534</b>	<b>23,192</b>	<b>5,951,164</b>
<b>Washington:</b>				
Administrative sites.....	170			170
Aid of legislation.....	82			82
Classification.....	627			627
Coal.....	692,607			692,607
Fish-culture purposes.....	10			10
Power sites.....	98,994			98,994
Public waters.....	920			920
Reservoir sites.....	36,327			36,327
Resurvey.....	5,840			5,840
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>835,577</b>			<b>835,577</b>
<b>Wyoming:</b>				
Administrative sites.....	1,200	74		1,274
Aid of legislation.....	851,435	320		851,755
Air mail station.....	120			120
Classification.....	5,760			5,760
Coal.....	2,200,964			2,200,964
Elk refuge.....	26,219	18,150	1,400	42,969
Fish culture.....	400			400
Game refuge.....	1,516			1,516
Landing for airplanes.....	471			471
National Guard rifle range.....		160		160
Pending resurvey.....	467,929	200,138	122,450	545,617
Petroleum.....	1,126,043		3,960	1,122,083
Phosphate.....	994,969		3,680	991,289
Power site.....	81,263		938	80,325
Public waters.....	79,785	240		80,025
Reservoir sites.....	118,734			118,734
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>6,016,808</b>	<b>219,082</b>	<b>132,428</b>	<b>6,103,462</b>
<b>Grand total.....</b>	<b>55,967,238</b>	<b>729,611</b>	<b>387,230</b>	<b>56,109,619</b>

#### RECAPITULATION BY CLASSES

Class	Outstanding with- drawn Dec. 1, 1927	With- drawn Period Dec. 1, 1927, to Nov. 30, 1928	Restored Period Dec. 1, 1927, to Nov. 30, 1928	Out- standing with- drawn Nov. 30, 1928
Administrative sites.....	26,085	202	3,780	22,507
Adjust claims.....				
Adjust equitable rights.....	500			500
Agricultural experiment station.....	10,651	450		11,131
Aid of legislation.....	1,656,263	27,400		1,683,663
Air mail beacon sites and landing fields.....	3,360			3,360
Air mail station.....	120			120
Army airplane field.....	40			40
Biological survey.....	480			480
Bureau of Fisheries.....	160			160
Camp-site purposes.....	20			20
Classification.....	2,679,757	34,070	5,690	2,708,137
Cemetery purposes.....	10			10
Coal.....	30,524,071		57,086	30,466,985
Elk refuge.....	26,219	18,150	1,400	42,969
Experimental station.....	192,912			192,912
Fish-culture purposes.....	410			410
Forest administrative sites.....	879			879
Game refuge.....	1,516			1,516
Harbor development.....	3			3
Helium.....	7,100			7,100

Footnotes at end of table.

Withdrawals and restorations under act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847), during period December 1, 1927, to November 30, 1928, inclusive—Continued

RECAPITULATION BY CLASSES—continued

State and class of action	Outstanding with-drawn Dec. 1, 1927	Period Dec. 1, 1927, to Nov. 30, 1928		Outstanding with-drawn Nov. 30, 1928
		With-drawn	Restored	
Islands in coastal waters (Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, etc.) <sup>1</sup>	Acres	Acres	Acres	Acres
Landing field for airplanes	631			631
Lighthouse purposes	648			648
Lookout station		40		40
Mineral	8,507			8,507
Military purposes	52,477			52,477
National Guard target range	940	560		1,500
National-monument purposes	88,955	2,560		91,515
National-park purposes	2,267	6,400		8,667
Naval oil shale	135,324			135,324
Naval purposes				
Navy ammunition depot	125,724			125,724
Oil shale	123			123
Pending legislation	468			468
Pending resurvey	1,261,202	608,240	304,103	1,565,839
Petroleum	5,498,002		3,960	5,494,042
Phosphate	2,298,329		5,200	2,293,129
Potash	7,548,497			7,548,497
Power sites	2,502,460	275	5,359	2,497,376
Proposed monuments	7,667			7,987
Protect water supply	480			480
Protect hot springs		320		320
Public land on mainland (Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, etc.) <sup>1</sup>				
Public park	15,080			15,080
Public water reserves	363,417	29,380	118	392,679
Recreational or bird refuge	1,625			1,625
Regulate level Lake of the Woods	11,402			11,402
Reservoir sites	337,902	920		338,822
Road commission	2			2
Stock driveways	329,450			329,450
Sheep experimental stations	44,123			44,123
Tanahoe Hot Springs <sup>1</sup>				
Town-site purposes	540	114	534	120
Well-drilling reserves	120			120
Grand total	55,767,238	729,611	387,230	56,109,619

<sup>1</sup> All islands belonging to the United States in the coastal waters.

<sup>2</sup> All public lands of the United States on the mainland within 3 miles of the coast.

<sup>3</sup> 800 square feet.

<sup>4</sup> Area undetermined.

<sup>5</sup> Revoked.

<sup>6</sup> All islands belonging to the United States in the coastal waters; area unknown.

Respectfully submitted.

WILLIAM SPRY, Commissioner.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,  
Washington, December 10, 1929.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: The act of Congress entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to make withdrawals of public lands in certain cases," approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847), provides, among other things, that the Secretary of the Interior shall report all such withdrawals to Congress at the beginning of its next regular session after the date of the withdrawal.

In compliance with the requirements of the statute I have the honor to inclose herewith copy of a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, dated December 9, 1929, transmitting report of the withdrawals and restorations contemplated by the statute.

Very truly yours,

RAY LYMAN WILBUR.

Withdrawals and restorations under act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847), during period December 1, 1928, to November 30, 1929, inclusive

State and class of action	Outstanding with-drawn Dec. 1, 1928	Period Dec. 1, 1928, to Nov. 30, 1929		Outstanding with-drawn Nov. 30, 1929
		With-drawn	Restored	
Alabama:	Acres	Acres	Acres	Acres
Aid legislation	575			575
Classification <sup>1</sup>				
Do. <sup>2</sup>				
Do.	2,440			2,440
Recreational purposes	1,625			1,625
Power sites	120			120
Total	4,760			4,760
Alaska:				
Administrative sites	70			70
Agricultural experiment station	320			320
Biological survey	480			480
Bureau of Fisheries	160			160
Classification	230,006			230,006

Footnotes at end of table.

Withdrawals and restorations under act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847), during period December 1, 1928, to November 30, 1929, inclusive—Continued

State and class of action	Outstanding with-drawn Dec. 1, 1928	Period Dec. 1, 1928, to Nov. 30, 1929		Outstanding with-drawn Nov. 30, 1929
		With-drawn	Restored	
Alaska—Continued.	Acres	Acres	Acres	Acres
Cemetery purposes	10			10
Military reservations	3			3
Lighthouse	640			640
National-park purposes	2,480			2,480
Power sites	93,415			93,415
Protect water supply and marine station		20		20
Road commission	12			12
Tanahoe Hot Springs	( <sup>3</sup> )			
Total	327,586	20		327,606
Arizona:				
Administrative sites	684			684
Aid legislation	2,590			2,590
Army airplane field	40			40
Agricultural experiment station	10,651			10,651
Classification	104,127			104,127
Coal	139,415			139,415
Mineral	8,507			8,507
National Guard rifle range	400			400
National park	67			67
Pending resurvey	63,274			63,274
Petroleum	92,495			92,495
Public park	15,080			15,080
Power sites	433,034		15	433,019
Public waters	20,230	320	445	20,105
Stock driveways	329,450			329,450
Total	1,220,015	320	460	1,219,875
Arkansas:				
Classification	400	4,601		5,001
Pending resurvey		3,520		3,520
Power sites	21,994			21,994
Total	22,394	8,121		30,515
California:				
Aid legislation	604,242			604,242
Air mail beacon sites and landing field	2,680			2,680
Camp-site purposes	20			20
Classification	54,647	302,277		356,924
Coal	17,603			17,603
Forest administrative sites	1,199			1,199
Harbor development	3			3
Lighthouse	8			8
National-monument purposes		14,324		14,324
Pending resurvey	12,024	74,209		86,233
Petroleum	1,178,392			1,178,392
Potash	90,638			90,638
Power sites	290,656		1,805	288,851
Protect hot springs	320			320
Public waters	187,688	600		188,288
Reservoir sites	2,080			2,080
Town-site purposes	120			120
Total	2,442,320	391,410	1,805	2,831,925
Colorado:				
Administrative sites	302			302
Aid legislation	16,493			16,493
Classification	573,178			573,178
Coal	4,142,333			4,142,333
National-monument purposes	65	123		193
Naval oil shale	43,860			43,860
Petroleum	218,997			218,997
Pending resurvey	411,139	155,880		567,019
Power sites	225,641		5,210	220,431
Proposed monument	320			320
Public waters	5,028	1,520		6,548
Reservoir sites	102,460			102,460
Total	5,739,821	157,528	5,210	5,892,139
Florida:				
Adjustment equitable rights	500			500
Administrative sites	40			40
Classification <sup>1</sup>				
Do. <sup>2</sup>	222			222
Do.	( <sup>3</sup> )			
Naval purposes	468			468
Pending legislation	67,121			67,121
Phosphate				
Total	68,351			68,351
Idaho:				
Administrative sites	2,448			2,448
Aid legislation	51,840			51,840
Classification	80,628			80,628
Coal	4,761			4,761
Experimental station	28,427			28,427
National Guard rifle range	320			320
Phosphate	652,864			652,864
Power sites	201,694		38	201,656
Public waters	13,905	952		14,857
Reservoir sites	26,240			26,240
Total	1,063,127	952	38	1,064,041

Footnotes at end of table.

Withdrawals and restorations under act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847), during period December 1, 1928, to November 30, 1929, inclusive—Continued

State and class of action	Out-standing with-drawn Dec. 1, 1928	Period Dec. 1, 1928, to Nov. 30, 1929		Out-standing with-drawn Nov. 30, 1929
		With-drawn	Restored	
<b>Louisiana:</b>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>
Aid legislation.....	105			105
Petroleum.....	466,990			466,990
Total.....	467,095			467,095
<b>Michigan:</b>				
Aid legislation *.....				
Do.....	1,028			1,028
Classification.....	3,871			3,871
Power sites.....	1,240			1,240
Proposed monument.....	7,347			7,347
Total.....	13,486			13,486
<b>Minnesota:</b>				
Aid legislation.....	26,800		49	26,751
Classification.....	373			373
Power sites.....	12,309			12,309
Regulate level Lake of the Woods.....	11,402			11,402
Total.....	50,884		49	50,835
<b>Mississippi: Classification *:</b>				
<b>Montana:</b>				
Administrative sites.....	6,326			6,326
Agricultural field station.....	200			200
Aid legislation.....	1,134			1,134
Classification.....	236,270			236,270
Coal.....	7,816,351			7,816,351
Forest administrative sites.....	752			752
Pending resurvey.....		9,880		9,880
Petroleum.....	1,344,640			1,344,640
Phosphate.....	279,904			279,904
Power sites.....	127,772	393		128,165
Public waters.....	8,336	80		8,416
Reservoir sites.....	9,080			9,080
Sheep experiment station.....	15,776			15,776
Well-drilling reserve.....	40			40
Total.....	9,846,581	10,353		9,856,934
<b>Nebraska:</b>				
Administrative sites.....	39			39
Power sites.....	761			761
Total.....	800			800
<b>Nevada:</b>				
Administrative sites.....	534			534
Aid legislation.....	85,760			85,760
Air mail beacon sites and landing field.....	680			680
Classification.....	29,080	6,400		35,480
Coal.....	83,603			83,603
Classification (game reserve).....		30,598		30,598
Oil shale.....	123			123
Navy ammunition depot.....	125,724			125,724
National-monument purposes.....		150,422		150,422
Pending resurvey.....		18,040		18,040
Potash.....	39,492			39,492
Power sites.....	27,492		865	28,357
Public waters.....	11,346	1,420		12,766
Well-drilling reserves.....	80			80
Total.....	403,914	206,880	865	609,929
<b>New Mexico:</b>				
Administrative sites.....	593			593
Airplane landing field.....	160			160
Coal.....	5,113,294			5,113,294
Classification.....		160		160
Experimental station.....	192,872			192,872
Military purposes.....	52,480			52,480
National Guard target range.....	620			620
National-monument purposes.....	84,890			84,890
Pending resurvey.....	495,192	89,613		584,805
Potash.....	7,418,437	1,863,723		9,282,160
Power sites.....	61,449			61,449
Public waters.....	9,811	640		10,451
Total.....	13,429,798	1,954,136		15,383,934
<b>North Dakota:</b>				
Coal.....	6,192,486			6,192,486
Petroleum.....	84,894			84,894
Reservoir sites.....	478			478
Total.....	6,277,858			6,277,858
<b>Oregon:</b>				
Administrative sites.....	839			839
Aid legislation.....	27,761	44,863		72,624
Classification.....	1,344,082	119		1,344,201
Coal.....	4,361			4,361
Lookout station.....	40			40
Pending resurvey.....	6,200			6,200
Power sites.....	378,978		9,504	388,482
Public waters.....	21,481	4,720		26,201
Recreational or bird refuge *.....				
Reservoir sites.....	18,603			18,603
Total.....	1,802,345	49,702	9,504	1,842,543

Footnotes at end of table.

Withdrawals and restorations under act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847), during period December 1, 1928, to November 30, 1929, inclusive—Continued

State and class of action	Out-standing with-drawn Dec. 1, 1928	Period Dec. 1, 1928, to Nov. 30, 1929		Out-standing with-drawn Nov. 30, 1929
		With-drawn	Restored	
<b>South Dakota:</b>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>
Administrative sites.....	321			321
Aid legislation.....	37,240		12,010	25,230
Protect water supply.....	480			480
Public waters.....	240			240
Total.....	38,281		12,010	26,271
<b>Utah:</b>				
Administrative sites.....	360			360
Aid legislation.....	3,401			3,401
Adjust claims *.....				
Classification.....	42,569	1,032		44,501
Coal.....	3,975,353			3,975,353
Helium.....	7,100			7,100
National-monument purposes.....	160			160
National-park purposes.....	12,800	5,057		17,857
Naval oil shale.....	91,464			91,464
Pending resurvey.....	27,177			27,177
Petroleum.....	985,550			985,550
Phosphate.....	301,945			301,945
Power sites.....	441,394		3,720	437,674
Public waters.....	35,941	2,000		37,941
Reservoir sites.....	26,040			26,040
Total.....	5,951,164	8,989	3,720	5,956,433
<b>Washington:</b>				
Administrative sites.....	170			170
Aid legislation.....	82			82
Classification.....	627			627
Coal.....	692,607			692,607
Fish-culture purposes.....	10			10
Lookout station.....		40		40
Power sites.....	98,994		49	99,043
Public waters.....	920			920
Reservoir sites.....	36,327			36,327
Resurvey.....	5,840			5,840
Total.....	835,577	40	49	835,566
<b>Wisconsin: Classification.....</b>		1,579		1,579
<b>Wyoming:</b>				
Administrative sites.....	1,274			1,274
Aid legislation.....	851,755			851,755
Air mail station.....	120		120	
Classification.....	5,760			5,760
Coal.....	2,260,964			2,260,964
Elk refuge.....	42,969			42,969
Fish culture.....	400			400
Game refuge.....	1,516			1,516
Landing for airplanes.....	471			471
National Guard rifle range.....	160			160
Pending resurvey.....	545,617	143,261		688,878
Petroleum.....	1,122,083			1,122,083
Phosphate.....	991,289			991,289
Power site.....	80,325			80,325
Proposed elk refuge.....		264,808	12,059	252,749
Public waters.....	80,025	3,520	640	82,905
Reservoir sites.....	118,734			118,734
Total.....	6,103,462	411,589	12,819	6,502,232
<b>Grand total.....</b>	<b>56,109,619</b>	<b>3,201,619</b>	<b>46,529</b>	<b>59,264,709</b>

# RECAPITULATION BY CLASSES

Administrative sites.....	22,507			22,507
Adjust claims *.....				
Adjust equitable rights.....	500			500
Agricultural experiment station.....	11,131			11,131
Aid of legislation.....	1,683,663	44,863	12,059	1,710,467
Air mail beacon sites and landing fields.....	3,360			3,360
Air mail station.....	120		120	
Army airplane field.....	40			40
Biological survey.....	480			480
Bureau of Fisheries.....	160			160
Camp-site purposes.....	20			20
Classification.....	2,708,137	317,068		3,025,205
Cemetery purposes.....	10			10
Coal.....	30,466,985			30,466,985
Elk refuge.....	42,969			42,969
Experimental station.....	192,912			192,912
Fish-culture purposes.....	410			410
Forest administrative sites.....	879			879
Game refuge.....	1,516	30,598		32,114
Harbor development.....	3			3
Helium.....	7,100			7,100
Islands in coastal waters (Alabama, Florida, Mississippi) *.....				
Landing fields for airplanes.....	631			631
Lighthouse purposes.....	648			648
Lookout station.....	40	40		80
Mineral.....	8,507			8,507
Military purposes.....	52,477			52,477
National Guard target range.....	1,500			1,500
National-monument purposes.....	91,515	164,874		256,389
National-park purposes.....	8,667	5,057		13,724
Naval oil shale.....	135,324			135,324

Footnotes at end of table.

Withdrawals and restorations under act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847), during period December 1, 1928, to November 30, 1929, inclusive—Continued

RECAPITULATION BY CLASSES—continued

State and class of action	Out-standing withdrawn Dec. 1, 1928	Period Dec. 1, 1928, to Nov. 30, 1929		Out-standing withdrawn Nov. 30, 1929
		With-drawn	Restored	
	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>
Naval purposes <sup>1</sup> .....	125,724	—	—	125,724
Navy ammunition depot.....	123	—	—	123
Oil shale.....	468	—	—	468
Pending legislation.....	1,565,839	494,403	—	2,060,242
Pending resurvey.....	5,494,042	—	—	5,494,042
Petroleum.....	2,263,129	—	—	2,263,129
Phosphate.....	7,548,497	1,863,723	—	9,412,220
Potash.....	—	264,808	12,059	252,749
Proposed elk refuge.....	2,497,376	393	21,206	2,476,563
Power sites.....	7,987	—	—	7,987
Proposed monuments.....	480	20	—	500
Protect water supply.....	320	—	—	320
Protect hot springs.....	—	—	—	—
Public land on mainland (Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, etc.) <sup>2</sup>	15,080	—	—	15,080
Public park.....	392,679	15,772	1,085	407,366
Recreational or bird refuge.....	1,625	—	—	1,625
Regulate level Lake of the Woods.....	11,402	—	—	11,402
Reservoir sites.....	338,822	—	—	338,822
Road commission.....	2	—	—	2
Stock driveways.....	329,450	—	—	329,450
Sheep experiment stations.....	44,123	—	—	44,123
Tanakee Hot Springs <sup>3</sup> .....	120	—	—	120
Town-site purposes.....	120	—	—	120
Well-drilling reserves.....	—	—	—	—
Grand total.....	56,109,619	3,201,619	46,529	59,264,709

<sup>1</sup> All islands belonging to the United States in the coastal waters.

<sup>2</sup> All public lands belonging to the United States on the mainland within 3 miles of the coast.

<sup>3</sup> 800 square feet.

<sup>4</sup> Area undetermined.

Respectfully submitted,

C. C. MOORE, Commissioner.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,  
WASHINGTON, December 9, 1930.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

Sir: The act of Congress entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to make withdrawals of public lands in certain cases," approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847), provides, among other things, that the Secretary of the Interior shall report all such withdrawals to Congress at the beginning of its next regular session after the date of the withdrawal.

In compliance with the requirements of the statute, I have the honor to inclose herewith copy of a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, dated December 8, 1930, transmitting report of the withdrawals and restorations contemplated by the statute.

Very respectfully,

RAY LYMAN WILBUR.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
GENERAL LAND OFFICE,  
WASHINGTON, December 8, 1930.

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Sir: Under section 3, act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847), the Secretary of the Interior is required to report to Congress all withdrawals made under said act at the beginning of its next regular session after the date of withdrawal. To that end I transmit a report, in sextuple, showing the withdrawals and restorations made under said act through this office, including those made on recommendation of the Director of the Geological Survey, during the period beginning December 1, 1929, and ending November 30, 1930. The report also shows areas embraced in outstanding withdrawals at the latter date.

Very respectfully,

C. C. MOORE, Commissioner.

Withdrawals and restorations under act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847), during period December 1, 1929, to November 30, 1930, inclusive

State and class of action	Out-standing withdrawn Dec. 1, 1929	Period Dec. 1, 1929, to Nov. 30, 1930		Out-standing withdrawn Nov. 30, 1930
		Withdrawn	Restored	
	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>
Alabama:				
Aid legislation.....	575	—	—	575
Classification.....	—	—	—	—
Do.....	2,440	—	—	2,440
Recreational purposes.....	1,625	—	—	1,625
Power sites.....	120	—	—	120
Total.....	4,760	—	—	4,760

Footnotes at end of table.

Withdrawals and restorations under act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847), during period December 1, 1929, to November 30, 1930, inclusive—Continued

State and class of action	Out-standing withdrawn Dec. 1, 1929	Period Dec. 1, 1929, to Nov. 30, 1930		Out-standing withdrawn Nov. 30, 1930
		Withdrawn	Restored	
	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>
Alaska:				
Administrative sites.....	70	—	—	70
Agricultural experiment station.....	320	—	—	320
Biological survey.....	480	—	—	480
Bureau of Fisheries.....	160	—	—	160
Classification.....	230,006	—	—	230,006
Cemetery purposes.....	10	—	—	10
Military reservations.....	3	—	—	3
Lighthouse.....	640	—	—	640
National-park purposes.....	2,480	—	—	2,480
Office of education.....	—	22,801.75	—	22,801.75
Power sites.....	93,415	—	804	92,521
Protect water supply and marine station.....	20	—	—	20
Radio station.....	—	464.62	—	464.62
Railroad.....	—	.25	—	.25
Road commission.....	2	.73	—	2.73
Tanakee Hot Springs <sup>1</sup> .....	—	—	—	—
Town-site purposes.....	—	1.11	—	1.11
Total.....	327,606	23,268.46	894	349,980.46
Arizona:				
Administrative sites.....	684	—	—	684
Aid legislation.....	2,590	—	—	2,590
Army airplane field.....	40	—	—	40
Agricultural experiment station.....	10,651	—	—	10,651
Classification.....	104,127	—	—	104,127
Coal.....	139,415	—	—	139,415
Custom service.....	—	10	—	10
Mineral.....	8,507	—	—	8,507
National Guard rifle range.....	400	—	—	400
National park.....	67	—	—	67
National-monument purposes.....	—	2,683,360	—	2,683,360
Pending resurvey.....	63,274	—	—	63,274
Petroleum.....	92,496	84,454	—	176,950
Public park.....	15,080	—	—	15,080
Power sites.....	433,019	—	553	432,466
Public waters.....	20,105	1,365	220	21,250
Stock driveways.....	329,450	—	—	329,450
Total.....	1,219,875	2,769,189	773	3,988,264
Arkansas:				
Classification.....	5,001	—	—	5,001
Pending resurvey.....	3,520	9,400	—	12,920
Power sites.....	21,994	—	40	21,954
Total.....	30,515	9,400	40	39,875
California:				
Aid legislation.....	604,242	—	—	640,242
Air mail beacon sites and landing field.....	2,680	—	—	2,680
Camp-site purposes.....	20	—	—	20
Classification.....	356,924	35,826	—	392,750
Coal.....	17,603	—	—	17,603
Forest administrative sites.....	1,199	—	—	1,199
Harbor development.....	3	—	—	3
Lighthouse.....	8	—	—	8
National-monument purposes.....	14,324	2,000,000	—	2,014,324
Pending resurvey.....	89,233	—	—	89,233
Petroleum.....	1,178,392	—	—	1,178,392
Potash.....	90,638	—	—	90,638
Power sites.....	288,851	—	200	288,651
Protect hot springs.....	320	40	—	360
Public waters.....	188,288	1,085	680	188,693
Reservoir sites.....	2,080	—	40	2,040
Town-site purposes.....	120	160	—	280
Water supply, city of Napa.....	—	160	—	160
Total.....	2,831,925	2,037,271	920	4,868,276
Colorado:				
Administrative sites.....	302	—	—	302
Aid legislation.....	16,493	18,872	—	35,365
Classification.....	573,178	—	—	573,178
Coal.....	4,142,338	—	—	4,142,338
National Guard rifle range.....	—	1,999.22	—	1,999.22
National-monument purposes.....	193	—	—	193
National-park purposes.....	—	120	—	120
Natural oil shale.....	43,860	—	—	43,860
Oil shale.....	—	1,496,027	—	1,496,027
Petroleum.....	218,997	—	1,335.26	217,661.74
Pending resurvey.....	567,019	99,424	—	666,443
Power sites.....	220,431	—	1,490	218,941
Proposed monument.....	320	—	—	320
Public waters.....	6,548	1,845	380	8,013
Reservoir sites.....	102,460	—	—	102,460
Total.....	5,892,139	1,618,287.22	3,205.26	7,507,220.96
Florida:				
Adjustment equitable rights.....	509	—	—	509
Administrative sites.....	40	—	—	40

Footnotes at end of table.

Withdrawals and restorations under act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847), during period December 1, 1929, to November 30, 1930, inclusive—Continued

State and class of action	Out-standing withdrawn Dec. 1, 1929	Period Dec. 1, 1929, to Nov. 30, 1930		Out-standing withdrawn Nov. 30, 1930
		Withdrawn	Restored	
<b>Florida—Continued.</b>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>
Classification <sup>1</sup>				
Do. <sup>1</sup>	222	222		448
Naval purposes <sup>1</sup>	468			468
Pending legislation	67,121		230	66,841
Phosphate				
Total	68,351	222	230	68,297
<b>Idaho:</b>				
Administrative sites	2,448			2,448
Aid legislation	51,840	1,280		53,120
Classification	80,628			80,628
Coal	4,761			4,761
Experimental station	28,427	120		28,547
National Guard rifle range	320			320
Phosphate	652,864			652,864
Power sites	201,656		9,093	191,963
Public waters	14,857	560		15,417
Reservoir sites	26,240			26,240
Total	1,064,041	1,960	9,093	1,056,308
<b>Louisiana:</b>				
Aid legislation	105			105
Petroleum	466,990			466,990
Total	467,095			467,095
<b>Michigan:</b>				
Aid legislation	1,028		160	868
Do. <sup>1</sup>				
Classification	3,871	80		3,951
Power sites	1,240			1,240
Proposed monument	7,347			7,347
Total	13,486	80	160	13,406
<b>Minnesota:</b>				
Aid legislation	26,751	21,655		48,406
Classification	373			373
Pending resurvey		20,355		20,355
Power sites	12,309			12,309
Regulate level Lake of the Woods	11,402			11,402
Total	50,835	42,010		92,845
<b>Mississippi: Classification.<sup>1</sup></b>				
<b>Montana:</b>				
Administrative sites	6,326			6,326
Agricultural field station	200			200
Aid legislation	1,134		1,134	
Classification	236,270		9,949	226,321
Coal	7,816,351			7,816,351
Forest administrative sites	752	40		792
Pending resurvey	9,880			9,880
Petroleum	1,344,640			1,344,640
Phosphate	279,904			279,904
Power sites	128,165		1,233	126,932
Public waters	8,416	920	160	9,176
Reservoir sites	9,080			9,080
Sheep experimental station	15,776			15,776
Well-drilling reserve	40			40
Total	9,856,934	960	12,476	9,845,418
<b>Nebraska:</b>				
Administrative sites	39			39
Power sites	761			761
Total	800			800
<b>Nevada:</b>				
Administrative sites	534			534
Aid legislation	85,760			85,760
Air mail beacon sites and landing field	680			680
Classification	35,480			35,480
Coal	83,603			83,603
Classification (game reserve)	30,598			30,598
Oil shale	123			123
Navy ammunition depot	125,724			125,724
National-monument purposes	150,422	15,680		166,102
Pending resurvey	18,040	46,028		64,068
Potash	39,492			39,492
Power sites	26,627			26,627
Public waters	12,766	2,630		15,446
Well-drilling reserves	80			80
Total	609,929	64,388		674,317
<b>New Mexico:</b>				
Administrative sites	593			593
Airplane landing field	160			160
Coal	5,113,294			5,113,294
Classification	160			160
Experimental station	192,872			192,872
Military purposes	52,480			52,480

Footnotes at end of table.

Withdrawals and restorations under act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847), during period December 1, 1929, to November 30, 1930, inclusive—Continued

State and class of action	Out-standing withdrawn Dec. 1, 1929	Period Dec. 1, 1929, to Nov. 30, 1930		Out-standing withdrawn Nov. 30, 1930
		Withdrawn	Restored	
<b>New Mexico—Continued.</b>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>
National Guard target range	620	880		880
National-monument purposes	84,890	207,360		292,250
National-park purposes		34,560		34,560
Pending resurvey	584,805	202,945		787,750
Potash	9,282,160			9,282,160
Power sites	61,449			61,449
Public waters	10,451	1,120	1,685	9,886
Total	15,383,934	546,865	2,305	15,823,494
<b>North Dakota:</b>				
Aid legislation		5,900		5,900
Coal	6,192,486			6,192,486
Petroleum	84,894			84,894
Reservoir sites	478			478
Total	6,277,858	5,900		6,283,758
<b>Oregon:</b>				
Administrative sites	839			839
Aid legislation	72,624	98,420		171,044
Classification	1,344,201			1,344,201
Coal	4,361			4,361
Lookout station	40	40		80
Pending resurvey	6,200			6,200
Power sites	369,474		11,627	357,847
Public waters	26,201	2,301		28,502
Recreational or bird refuge <sup>1</sup>				
Reservoir sites	18,603			18,603
Total	1,842,543	100,761	11,627	1,931,677
<b>South Dakota:</b>				
Administrative sites	321			321
Aid legislation	25,230			25,230
Protect water supply	480			480
Public waters	240			240
Total	26,271			26,271
<b>Utah:</b>				
Administrative sites	360			360
Aid legislation	3,401			3,401
Adjust claims <sup>1</sup>				
Classification	44,501	10,050		54,551
Coal	3,975,353		58,126	3,917,227
Helium	7,100			7,100
National-monument purposes	160			160
National-park purposes	17,857	3,350		21,207
Naval oil shale	91,464			91,464
Oil shale		2,754,959		2,754,959
Pending resurvey	27,177			27,177
Petroleum	985,550			985,550
Phosphate	301,945			301,945
Power sites	437,584		5,077	432,507
Public waters	37,941	2,730		40,671
Reservoir sites	26,040			26,040
Total	5,956,433	2,771,089	63,203	8,664,319
<b>Washington:</b>				
Administrative sites	170	40		210
Aid legislation	82			82
Classification	627			627
Coal	692,607			692,607
Fish-culture purposes	10			10
Lookout station	40	80		120
Power sites	98,945	520	5,866	93,599
Public waters	920			920
Reservoir sites	36,327			36,327
Resurvey	5,840			5,840
Total	835,563	640	5,866	830,342
<b>Wisconsin: Classification.</b>	1,579			1,579
<b>Wyoming:</b>				
Administrative sites	1,274			1,274
Aid legislation	851,755	66,300	71,040	847,015
Classification	5,760			5,760
Coal	2,260,964			2,260,964
Elk refuge	42,969			42,969
Fish culture	400			400
Game refuge	1,516			1,516
Landing for airplanes	471			471
National Guard and rifle range	160			160
Oil shale		4,006,805		4,006,805
Pending resurvey	688,878	190,379		789,257
Petroleum	1,122,083			1,122,083
Phosphate	991,289			991,289
Power sites	80,325	1,167		81,492
Proposed elk refuge	252,749	3,350		256,099
Public waters	82,005	1,760		83,765
Reservoir sites	118,734			118,734
Total	6,502,232	4,179,761	71,040	10,610,953
<b>Grand total</b>	<b>59,264,709</b>	<b>13,890,260.42</b>	<b>182,281.68</b>	<b>73,154,999.64</b>

Footnotes at end of table

Withdrawals and restorations under act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847), during period December 1, 1929, to November 30, 1930, inclusive—Continued

## RECAPITULATION BY CLASSES

State and class of action	Out-standing withdrawn Dec. 1, 1929	Period Dec. 1, 1929, to Nov. 30, 1930		Out-standing withdrawn Nov. 30, 1930
		Withdrawn	Restored	
	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>
Administrative sites.....	22,507	40		22,547
Adjust claims <sup>1</sup> .....				
Adjust equitable rights.....	500			500
Agricultural experiment station.....	11,131	120		11,251
Aid legislation.....	1,716,467	212,427	73,468	1,855,425
Air mail beacon sites and landing field.....	3,360			3,360
Army airplane field.....	40			40
Biological survey.....	480			480
Bureau of Fisheries.....	160			160
Camp-site purposes.....	20			20
Classification.....	3,025,205	46,182	9,949	3,061,438
Cemetery purposes.....	110			110
Coal.....	30,466,985		58,126	30,408,859
Customs service.....		10		10
Elk refuge.....	42,969			42,969
Experiment station.....	192,912			192,912
Fish-culture purposes.....	410			410
Forest administrative sites.....	879	40		919
Game refuge.....	32,114			32,114
Harbor development.....	3			3
Helium.....	7,100			7,100
Islands in coastal waters (Alabama, Florida, Mississippi) <sup>1</sup> .....				
Landing field for airplanes.....	631			631
Lighthouse purposes.....	648			648
Lookout station.....	40	120		160
Mineral.....	8,507			8,507
Military purposes.....	52,477			52,477
National Guard target range.....	1,500	2,879.22	620.68	2,258.54
National-monument purposes.....	256,389	4,006,400		5,162,789
National-park purposes.....	13,724	38,030		51,754
Naval oil shale.....	135,324			135,324
Naval purposes <sup>1</sup> .....				
Navy ammunition dump.....	125,724			125,724
Office of Education.....		22,801.75		22,801.75
Oil shale.....		8,257,791		8,257,791
Pending legislation.....	468			468
Petroleum.....	5,494,042			5,494,042
Phosphate.....	2,293,129		280	2,292,849
Potash.....	9,412,220			9,412,220
Proposed elk refuge.....	252,749	3,350		256,099
Power sites.....	2,476,563	1,687	36,673	2,441,577
Proposed monuments.....	7,987			7,987
Protect water supply.....	500	160		660
Protect hot springs.....	320			320
Public land on the mainland (Alabama, Florida, Mississippi) <sup>1</sup> .....				
Public park.....	15,080			15,080
Public water reserves.....	407,366	16,366	3,125	420,607
Radio station.....		464.62		464.62
Recreational or bird refuge.....	1,625			1,625
Regulate level Lake of the Woods.....	11,402			11,402
Reservoir sites.....	338,822		40	338,780
Road commission.....	2	.73		2.73
Resurvey.....	2,060,242			2,060,242
Stock driveways.....	329,450			329,450
Sheep experiment stations.....	44,123			44,123
Tanahoe Hot Springs <sup>1</sup> .....				
Town-site purposes.....	120	160		280
Well-drilling purposes.....	120			120
Grand total.....	59,264,709	13,890,290.42	182,281.68	73,154,999.64

<sup>1</sup> All islands belonging to United States in the coastal waters.

All public lands belonging to the United States on the mainland within 3 miles of the coast.

- Area undetermined.

Respectfully submitted.

C. C. MOORE, Commissioner.

## DROUGHT RELIEF

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 401.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 401), as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby notified that when the Senate voted for the drought relief measure it was the intent and purpose that the funds so provided would be used to afford relief to all families suffering from the drought, whether they live in counties where suffering is general and where there is great distress and destitution, or in counties where the distress caused by the drought is not general.

*Resolved further*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the relief here provided should be granted wherever the conditions and facts justify it, and the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby requested to see that that is done.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon when this resolution was presented the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] asked that it go over in order that he might look into it. The Senator is now in the Chamber, and I think he is agreeable to the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, when this matter came up yesterday I objected to its consideration. I think it is a useless instrument. It expresses exactly the views entertained by the Secretary of Agriculture and his agents as expressed when they were before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It is a direction the Secretary is going to follow. It is needless, and particularly harmless. I do not know why the Senator should press his resolution, because the Secretary of Agriculture will do that particular thing.

Mr. HEFLIN. I think it would be better for him to have the suggestion from the Senate.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MOSES. May this resolution be considered to-day except by unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent is required.

Mr. MOSES. I shall object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution goes over.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I hardly understand the position of the Senator from New Hampshire, except to say that it is in keeping with his position upon questions where human suffering is involved and where the rights of the masses of the people are at stake. The Senator is not known to be a man who is in sympathy with the masses of the people, but, rather, his sympathies are on the side of the favored few, where wealth is being concentrated more and more year after year. It does not concern the Senator from New Hampshire that men, women, and children are starving in the States. The Senator does not care, it seems, to have legislation enacted here that will carry relief to men, women, and children in distress in 21 States of this Union.

The Senator from New Hampshire objects to the consideration of this simple resolution, which merely requests the Secretary of Agriculture to use the funds provided by the Congress for the relief of men, women, and children in distress, to reach all of them, or as many of them as it is possible to reach, where the facts in the cases justify relief. The resolution itself says that the facts in the cases are to govern the Secretary of Agriculture.

I can not understand why the Senator from New Hampshire would interpose an objection to the consideration of a meritorious, a humane, a merciful resolution like the one I have proposed here to-day.

When Doctor Warburton was before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I raised the question whether it was the purpose to distribute this fund amongst all those who were in distress or whether it would be confined to counties where suffering and distress were general. He said they would administer it generally.

But, Mr. President, since that time Members of the House have called me up who have talked to Mr. Warburton and have expressed distress at his attitude. They have said they fear he is not going into the counties where there is no such abundance of distress as in the counties where it is general.

I submit, Mr. President, that the man whose family is suffering in a county over the line from one where the suffering is general and where nearly all the farmers are injuriously affected is just as much entitled to the consideration and mercy of the Government as are those where the suffering is more general; that it is the part of justice and right and mercy for the Government to go and minister to him and the wants of those where the suffering is not so general as it is to those where it is more general.

I can not understand why any Senator would take such an attitude. I do not appreciate the position taken by the Senator from New Hampshire. If the Senator wants to contribute to an extra session, if the Senator wants to fill the solid phalanx to fight for an extra session, he can very

easily do it. I do not propose that there shall be appropriated \$30,000,000 out of the purse of the people to remodel battleships when we can not even get unanimous consent from those on the other side of the Chamber to carry relief to the starving men, women, and children of my State. I do not propose to sit here and permit such a measly and miserable game of politics to be played. I will not stand for it. I know how to obtain my rights as a Senator, and if it is the purpose of those on the other side of the Chamber who are in temporary leadership to force us to a filibuster here in order to obtain the rights of the people in an extra session, let us understand it now and go to it.

I am not pleading for anything personal to myself. I am asking, Mr. President, for relief to be granted to people who are this day in dire distress—for a simple resolution of the Senate expressing its desire that the Secretary of Agriculture go and minister to the poor, the needy, the distressed, the starving, whether they are in hundreds or dozens, or only one, two, or three families. When I call up the resolution and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry withdraws his opposition, when it does not cost the Senate 5 cents nor the Government a nickel, yet the Senator from New Hampshire objects to its present consideration. Then let us consider what I propose to talk about the balance of the afternoon. Let the Senator from New Hampshire have time to meditate.

Mr. President, I am surprised that any Senator could be found in this body who would interpose an objection to this character of legislation. If the measure had been to refund money to millionaires, the Senator from New Hampshire would not have objected. If it had been a unanimous-consent proposition to take \$30,000,000 out of the Treasury and give it to the Steel Trust to remodel three old battleships, we never would have heard a murmur out of the Senator from New Hampshire. He would have sat with sealed lips and folded arms and we would not have heard a murmur from the Senator. But when we plead for the underdog in the fight, for the distressed people in 21 States, nearly half of the States of this great Union, the Senator from the great State of New Hampshire rises in his place and interposes an objection. We are simply asking the Secretary of Agriculture to do for people in localities where the suffering and distress is not so general just what he does for the individual families in the counties where the suffering and distress is general.

Now let us analyze the position of the Senator from New Hampshire. It puts him in the attitude of not wanting these people to have relief. It puts him in the attitude of saying that he does not care whether they get relief. It puts him in the attitude of opposing relief for those who do not happen to live in counties where the distress and suffering is general.

Mr. President, I have been in this body 10 years. I was reelected on the 4th day of November last by the largest majority that any Senator ever received in my State. I served 16½ years in the House. I have never voted to withhold one 5-cent piece from people who were in distress in New England. When fires have come, as in the case of Salem, Mass., I voted, and voted gladly, to go to their rescue. I have voted to aid people in every section of the country since I have been in Congress. Wherever the cry of distress has been heard, it never fell upon a deaf ear, so far as I am concerned. I have responded and I was always glad to respond.

We have the greatest country in all the world. One of the greatest evils now in it is the stealing of ballots, and one of the crying needs of the day is to put down the ballot-box burglars who make money, and big money, by manipulating elections. We have a case of it in my State that will astound the Nation when the investigation is made. As certainly as I live and God reigns I carried my State by around 100,000 majority last fall. The ballot-box thieves of Tammany and of Pittsburgh have nothing on the ballot-box crooks who are responsible for the stealing of the election in my State. Mr. President, if this country reaches the time when the voice of the people is stifled,

when they can not have full power and free expression by the ballot box and have their will recorded as they express it, then this Government is doomed.

The other great evil, Mr. President, is the New York Stock Exchange, which Mr. Raskob uses as a plaything. Whenever he needs campaign funds to bolster up a situation that he feels belongs to him personally, he goes upon the exchange and speculates. As I have said once before in this body, I believe that he and a group of them have tried to discredit Hoover's administration by bringing about crashes on the exchange. Mr. President, I do not care who he is, Democrat or Republican, he who will tamper with the prosperity of this country is not a good citizen. He is a bad citizen. He does not deserve to be the leader of any party. He deserves to be in the penitentiary.

Mr. President, New England is the section from which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses] comes, the quick-witted, bright Senator from New Hampshire who delights in and enjoys his own maneuvers and operations in this body and enjoys them exceedingly well. He smiles over his maneuvers and chuckles over them frequently when nobody else seems to enjoy them; but I am willing for him to do that.

Mr. President, I have called the attention of this body to the fact that the New York Stock Exchange gambling operations have held up \$300,000,000 worth of work in public buildings, homes, and hospitals in New England, and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses] has not opened his mouth on the subject—\$300,000,000 of money held up and all these building operations held back. What is that doing to New England? It is keeping labor from being employed. It is keeping the lumber people from selling lumber. It is keeping other business people from furnishing the material to be used in the construction of these buildings; but the Senator from New Hampshire is too busy looking after measures that probably might go through the Senate that would grant satisfaction to influential people somewhere to give his brilliant extraordinary ability to the matter of relieving New England, his State included, of the terrible evil that is now upon that section.

Whom are we attacking when we attack the gamblers of Wall Street? We are attacking the friends of the Senator from New Hampshire. The Senator from New Hampshire does not want his friends disturbed. Oh, how he basks in the sunshine and revels in the ineffable glory of those Wall Street fellows, who clip coupons and whose only music is the clink of dollars and dimes. What keen delight the Senator from New Hampshire manifests when he hears that kind of music being made by his rich, purse-proud, millionaire friends of Wall Street. But where is the Senator when relief is asked for the men and women whose boys took that flag and crossed the sea, who went 3,000 miles from home to fight to preserve the liberties of the world? Now, when they are in dire distress, when the wolf of want stands howling at their door, and we who hail from that section ask that relief be accorded to all those in distress, to all hungry men, women, and children, the Senator from New Hampshire, the temporary Presiding Officer of the Senate, comes down upon the floor, rises majestically in his place, and, cold-bloodedly as a fish, objects to the consideration of a simple resolution that merely asks the Secretary of Agriculture to be just and fair to all those who are hungry and who stand with outstretched hand begging for something to eat lest they die. That is the attitude of the Senator from New Hampshire.

I do not know whether the Senator from New Hampshire is in a secret arrangement with anybody to force an extra session or not. The Senator occupies so many attitudes, vast and variegated, that it is hard for me to put my finger on just where he stands. That his heart beats in sympathy with Raskob and his "wet" program, I guess there is hardly any doubt. I do not know; I should like to know. However, this one thing I do know: The Senator has got to do something to convince me that he ever had a heart-beat in sympathy with the masses of the common people. When any question comes up here affecting plutocracy,

look out for the Senator from New Hampshire; he is right on the job, keen-eyed, alert, vigorous. Oh, he is here looking out for their interests. Mr. President, think of five or six hundred men and women and children, driven from their homes in Arkansas, by gaunt famine, going to the city of England, and there, holding up their hands, begging for bread, pleading for something to eat. When they are asked, "Why do you not eat your farm animals?" the answer is, "They are dead on the field; the drought has made it impossible to provide food for man or beast." We are getting letters and telegrams every day from the drought-afflicted areas saying, "For God's sake do something; hurry up this relief; see to it that relief is granted in the counties where there are two or three hundred families in distress, or 500 families, and that relief be not confined to the counties where there are fifteen hundred in distress." Yet when we ask that an expression of the Senate be conveyed to the Secretary of Agriculture requesting that relief be accorded to all starving people, the Senator from New Hampshire arises and objects. He objects to what? What is the reason for his objection? Is he against feeding the poor who are starving?

I invite his attention to the vision of Sir Launfal, when the Master appeared to him and told him, "When you feed these starving people you are serving Me; when you do that you feed three—yourself, your starving neighbor, and Me." Mr. President, such things do not have any effect upon the Senator from New Hampshire; but if news should come that a crash had occurred on the New York Stock Exchange, and the gamblers were in panic and needed aid from the Government to pull them out of a hole, I would expect to see the Senator arise and ask that the Government go to their rescue; yet the devilish operations of that exchange are every day sending men to death; men are killing themselves; they are committing suicide.

Has the Senator ever raised his hand against that deadly evil? Mr. President, I recall the story of the serpent of Rhodes. The deadly beast, whose home was in a cavern under the hills, would come out in the afternoon and devour sheep, cows, and horses and even the shepherds who minded their sheep. Dieu Donne de Gozon, a native of Provence, registered a vow to go out and fight him to the death. He was warned not to tackle this beast; that it had destroyed everybody who had attacked it. In his own heart, however, he was resolved to make the effort; he did so and slew and did away with that great beast. No more were sheep or their shepherds destroyed and cattle grazed unmolested because the deadly serpent had been removed. This thing in New York City, the New York Stock Exchange, Mr. Raskob's fond resort, must also be removed, so far as its harmful activities are concerned.

Here is an article in the North American Review by Robert Cruise McManus, which is headed:

While others talk, he pays the bills.

And here is an interesting excerpt from it:

If all this is evidence that Mr. Raskob has been sitting meekly by in New York while Harmonizer Shouse slapped backs indiscriminately in Washington, then a December blizzard is indicative of approaching spring.

Meanwhile, as the party was being consolidated from within, external circumstances were conspiring to strengthen it from without.

Listen:

The stock market collapsed and the Republican prosperity myth, in which so many voters had believed, was torn to ribbons. The Farm Board made its ill-starred attempt to stop the falling price of wheat, and the 8-year wrangle between the farmers and the Government grew more acute, spurred by the notion that agriculture did not get what was promised it in the tariff bill.

There he is hinting very strongly that Raskob had a hand in the crash on the New York Stock Exchange.

Mr. President, we ought not to permit a place to exist where the idle rich—I do not care whether they are Republicans or Democrats—can go with their accumulated millions to make a happy holiday by speculating in the necessities of life, by beating down the price of wheat and robbing the farmers of the West, beating down the price of

cotton and robbing the farmers of the South, and beating down the price of securities, stocks, and bonds, tossing them up and flinging them down at will. That thing ought to be regulated; something has got to be done.

The New York Stock Exchange is injuriously affecting the people of my State now, and the people of every other State in the Union. It contributed greatly to the distress that exists in the States, and then the drought coming on top of that made it impossible for farmers in many sections, by their own efforts, to supply themselves with the food and clothing necessary to shelter and protect them and to give them comfort and keep them alive during the present winter.

Mr. President, as I said a while ago, Members of the House who have talked to me stated that they feared that Mr. Warburton would not go into some counties and reach those who are in dire distress, because there were not enough of them. My God, think of that! A dozen families in one county confront the wolf standing at their door, there is no food in their houses, they are in want, and they are told, "No; we can not save you because there are not enough of you." That amounts to the Government putting a premium on increased numbers in distress.

Mr. President, I am seeking to clear up this matter and to put the Senate, the greatest lawmaking body in the world, on record as telling the Secretary of Agriculture, "We desire you to take these funds that have been provided and go into all places wherever you find want and distress and hunger caused by the drought and minister to the suffering people." Yet when I suggest here that it would be well, because of this confusion and because of this misunderstanding, for the Senate to express itself as provided in the resolution, that it tell the Secretary what it wishes him to do and tell him what its intention was in appropriating this money, the Senator from New Hampshire rises and says, "I object."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] asked that the resolution go over last night in order that he might look into it; to-day he withdrew his opposition to it, and no other Senator would have objected, I am sure; but the Senator from New Hampshire rose and interposed his objection. May the Lord have mercy on him. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I do not believe that the farmers of New Hampshire approve the stand taken by the Senator; I do not believe that the merchants of New Hampshire approve it; I do not believe that the bankers of New Hampshire approve it; I do not believe that the people generally in New Hampshire approve the stand he has taken to-day. He has by the objection he made caused me to occupy the floor for 30 minutes when we could have gone on with other business. He is contributing toward an extra session. It looks as if the Senator does not care if we have an extra session.

I have not wanted, Mr. President, to contribute to an extra session. I wanted us to finish up the work of this session and adjourn; but, if it is the purpose of those who are in authority to block legislation that would help the struggling poor in the States, then those of us who are here ought to band together and do whatever is necessary to accomplish what we want to accomplish in the name of justice, of fair play, and of right.

That is all I am asking. I am not pleading to appropriate money to the mighty rich anywhere. I am asking to use some of the money already appropriated for the people who are hungry, for people who can not help themselves, for people who are starving. I am getting letters and telegrams every day saying, "Hurry up this relief measure. Hurry it up." The secretary of agriculture of my State says, "Be sure to see to it that they give this relief to the families, a great number of them, in counties where the suffering is not so general, and see that they get some of this relief." I submit that that is the humane thing to do; it is the just and merciful thing to do; and I am simply trying to do that as a Senator from the State of Alabama.

Mr. President, these people followed me, drought stricken, hungry, and in distress. They could not be bought by the vast sums of money sent down from the East. They stood like

a stone wall and followed me through to the election and through the election day. Every day I was speaking to 3,000 and 4,000 people when my opponent was addressing 100 and 150 people. All over the State it was the general talk that my majority would be in the neighborhood of 100,000 votes; and then see what happened on the election day itself, not by the ballots, but by the manipulation of the ballots; by calling the ballots wrong, by stealing the election.

Why did they not rejoice, why did they not hurrah, the next day? Was there any booming of cannons? No. Was there any celebration of any kind, any rejoicing? Not a bit of it. Why? Because they were in possession of stolen goods; and they were as silent as the tomb. That is why. A seat in the Senate had been stolen.

Make your investigation and I will disclose to you something that will open your eyes; and if this Raskob brand of politics is to go on, look out for 1932. They will not spend so much money among the voters as they will spend in trying to buy managers and steal the election. If they had defeated me in the open fairly, I would have said, "All right; they have a right to do it, and I bow to their will." But when they read me out of the party after a conference with Raskob in New York, and I had to fight the machine backed by him, I whipped it to a frazzle all over my State.

The truth will disclose that I carried fifty-odd counties out of 67. They gave me 10, and gave Bankhead 57 and 50,000 majority. There never has been a steal like it since I have been in public life.

Mr. President, I digressed for the moment there. These people, out of employment, were sought, and efforts were made to buy some of them; but they stood firm. Some merchants intimidated farmers in distress and threatened to cut off supplies they were furnishing if they did not vote against me. This machine was operated from New York down to the ballot box in my State; but these people stood true, God bless them! Now, in their dire distress, I stand here and plead for justice to them. They have never deserted me, and I have never deserted them. I have never lowered my arm in battle for them; and I shall do what Senator Bob La Follette, the old war horse from Wisconsin, told me to do after the first speech I made in this body, standing over there, fighting those who helped to bring on the deflation panic in 1920.

I led the fight, single-handed and alone, for a year and a half, to drive Governor Harding, of my State, a Democrat, from his position at the head of the Federal Reserve Board. He had conspired with the gamblers of New York to produce a panic so that they could compel the sale of Liberty bonds, and they were sold at \$80 and \$85 on the hundred, and these millionaires bought them up. Now they are sitting around idle in New York, using this money to speculate on the stock exchange.

Senator La Follette has a worthy son in this body, bearing his name, who will in time, I believe, be as great a Senator as his father; and he will have to "go some" to do it. Not only was the elder Bob La Follette able, but he was one of the most fearless and incorruptible men that ever sat in this body. He never forgot the common masses of the common people. He loved them with a beautiful and sincere ardor, and they never forgot him. He came over to me when I had made that speech. I was receiving no support. There were only five Senators who took any active interest in it before the fight started, but when it was over I had about 57 out of 96 on my side. Senator La Follette came over when I had finished my first speech, shook my hand, and said, "Tom, you made a fine speech. I want to congratulate you. Do not let these old fogies make you take a back seat until you have served here two years. You get in the fight. Your people are entitled to the very best you can give them from the day you enter here until you go out." I have never forgotten his suggestion. He was right about it. They are entitled to the best that I can give them.

Mr. President, whether or not it amounts to anything, whether or not it falls upon the deaf ears of the Senator from New Hampshire, I shall do my duty as a Senator from Alabama, in the name of the people who have honored me and have stood lovingly and loyally by me all these years and who have never deserted me, even when I was branded as an opposition candidate to the Democratic Party, when I was standing true to the principles of my party. I do not propose that Raskob and Alfred Smith and that group shall pervert the Democratic Party from the ends of its institution.

Why, here is Frank Kent, this dynamic little pen wielder from Baltimore. I used to feet pretty hard toward Frank at times. He has jumped on me several times. I do not mind criticism. If it is constructive, I welcome it. It does not bother me much what kind it is. I know what I am and what my purposes are; but sometimes he has attacked me when he was not informed about the situation. He has done something recently, however, that shows me that he has more sense than I thought he had. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, he took John Jacob Raskob and laid him upon an operating table and administered chloroform to him and he operated on him in due and ancient form. [Laughter.] O Mr. President, it was a nice, clean operation. Frank wields a wicked pen; I will say that for him. He caught John unaware. John had been parading around here at the head of the Democratic Party. He calls himself the head of the party. Is not he a nice person to be at the head of the great party of Jefferson? My God! [Laughter.] John would not know a Democratic principle from a mouse-colored mule [laughter]; yet he is the leader of our party. He will not be the leader long. The Democrats of this country are doing a lot of thinking. There are going to be a lot of changes, and you are going to hear some hell-burstings in 1932 that you have not heard yet.

Why, this is the man who in 1928 suggested in order to whip the Protestant preachers into line that they should have their salaries cut down. It looks as if he believes in the poverty plan as much as the Senator from New Hampshire. Cut them down! He never denied that until the campaign was over. This man, a member of the Union League Club, a Republican club, of Philadelphia, never admitted being a member of that organization until just recently in his letter to Frank Kent. Frank must have hit him around where he lives, because he commenced making denials and said that he was a member of the Union League Club.

Mr. President, some Senators will recall that in 1929 I got Who's Who, and read it right here, showing that Raskob was a member of the club; and statements went over the land saying that he had been a member, but he had resigned. Now, what does he say to Frank Kent? He says that he has not resigned, and that his resignation has not been asked for; and he says that his voting for some Democrat did not hurt his standing.

My understanding is that when you join that club they ask you if you are a Republican and vote the Republican ticket, and if you do not answer in the affirmative you do not get in. I will ask the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] if that is not so. Is he a member of this club in Philadelphia?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, is the Senator asking me whether I am a member?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. REED. Yes; I am.

Mr. HEFLIN. Were these questions asked the Senator? What questions were asked the Senator, if any, when he joined the club? [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Let us have him sworn. [Laughter.]

Mr. HEFLIN. I want to ask the Senator if they asked him if he was a Republican.

Mr. REED. The Senator means when I joined the club?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. REED. Yes; I did.

Mr. HEFLIN. Did they ask the Senator if he voted the Republican ticket?

Mr. REED. Yes. I was proud to say that I had.

Mr. HEFLIN. Does the Senator think they ask all candidates that?

Mr. REED. I do not know whether they asked Mr. Raskob. I was not there when he went in.

Mr. HEFLIN. But they asked the Senator that?

Mr. REED. Yes; they asked me.

Mr. HEFLIN. I suppose these clubs ask all prospective members the same question. They usually have them printed. Anyhow, Mr. Raskob says that he is still a member.

Mr. President, I have charged a number of times during the campaign and since, that he was a Republican, a lifelong Republican. Others charged it. He never denied it. Instead of denying it, he said he had accepted the chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee purely and wholly for the purpose of ridding the country of the damnable affliction of prohibition. That was charged on the hustings in every State in the Union. It was carried from one end of this Nation to the other, practically, and John Jacob Raskob never denied it until he came over here last spring and testified before the lobby committee. I do not know who suggested to Johnny to deny that, but evidently somebody did, and Johnny denied it for the first time nearly a year after the campaign was over, and after he had read it probably hundreds of times in the press. He came out and said that, oh, well, he did not say it, and that he had given a statement to the press denying that he said it. Then he was requested to show the statement, and he could not find the statement. Is not that too bad? Somebody must have hidden that statement from Johnny; must have put it where Johnny could not find it. That is not all. He was bereft of the memory as to what paper it appeared in. And Johnny has been unable to this good day to show that he gave a statement back there denying that awful thing that he said in 1928.

Now as to Frank Kent. I do not propose that he shall be run over by John Raskob. I will not permit any dear, enthusiastic, admiring friend of mine to be treated in that fashion. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, Frank came out in his statement and said that Raskob had picked Mr. Shouse and put him down here at the head of another committee, and told how much he was paying his assistant, some twenty-odd thousand dollars, and how much he was paying Mr. Shouse, and that Raskob was putting up the coin of the realm. Mr. Raskob comes back and says that he had nothing to do with the selection of Shouse. He should not reflect on Shouse in that fashion. He never had anything to do with him, he said; Shouse was selected by the committee.

There is more fraud and trick politics being played right now with that bunch than I ever heard of. Do you remember the big banquet held in Boston in 1929, or perhaps the spring of 1930? Mr. Shouse went up and made a speech, and there were several Democrats from Boston who had struck several blows for liberty and were well organized by the time the banquet was in good order. They got the idea that Shouse was trying to displace Raskob, and they did not want to hear Shouse speak. Somebody in authority up at the head of the banquet board rose and called on the man who was trying more than any other to keep Shouse from speaking—I think his name was Donahue—and told him to be quiet, that Mr. Shouse was selected personally by Alfred Smith and John J. Raskob. I put that in the Record.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Is the Senator denouncing Raskob or defending Kent?

Mr. HEFLIN. Oh, I am defending Kent and eulogizing Raskob. [Laughter.]

Then Mr. Raskob goes on to say that his grandmother was a Democrat, his great-grandfather was a Democrat, and he married a Democrat, and just to show what sort of a good Democrat he was he said he bolted the party in 1896 and had affiliated with it since. He said, "When I did affiliate

with the party and got into it I saw the prospects were good to get all the money back that I lent it, so here goes."

Is not the party in an awful fix?—

Mary had a little lamb,  
Its fleece was white as snow;  
It followed her to Pittsburgh one day,  
And look at the derved thing now.

[Laughter.]

Leadership! Where is the leadership in which the party gloried in the old days? The great party of Jefferson selected its leadership because of the outstanding character of some well-known Democrat, a man whose love of Democratic principles, whose devotion to his duty as a Democrat had appealed to the people the Nation over. We abandoned that practice. The fires of lofty purpose and high principles went out on the altar. The veil was rent in the temple, the party was perverted from the ends of its institution, and John Raskob was put at the head of it, a lifelong Republican, picked out of the party of the opposition bodily and put over at the head of the column of the Democrats. And now he likes it so well he feels as if he owns it.

Mr. President, old Pertinax, of Rome, sold the emperorship for \$500,000, and the Democratic Party owes Raskob \$100,000 more than Pertinax got for the emperorship of Rome.

Talk about the Democratic Party! I appeal to Democrats who hear me to gird up their loins to the battle to relieve our party of its present leadership. If that leadership stays at the head of the party in 1932, Democrats are not going to support that leadership. You may just as well get that in your heads now.

The party is led by a chief of Tammany, where judges' places on the bench are sold to the highest bidder, where the judicial ermine is waved around in the corrupt altar places of Tammany and bartered to those who pay the most to wear that ermine, which should be worn by a spotless judge, and a spotless judge alone, who holds the scales of justice.

Investigations are going on over there now. Tammany is selling offices and raising campaign funds, and men growing rich out of graft, and John Raskob, with his money bags, is stalking the Nation over, leading the party at his heels with a chain around its neck. The leader of the Democratic Party!

Mr. President, he admitted here in his testimony that he was contributing toward the salary of Curran, who told the Senate committee that revolution might be resorted to in behalf of liquor. He did not use those words, but they asked him when he testified before that committee, "What are you going to do? Are you going to resort to violence to set at naught the law in the Constitution and statute books?" He said: "We will cross that bridge when we come to it." "Would you resort to violence?" He never said he would not, and Raskob admitted he was paying him \$5,000 of his salary; and he at the head of the Democratic Party!

Oh, how my party has suffered, how it has suffered, and in behalf of the Democrats of this Nation I ask, who will deliver the party from the body of this death?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I sent to the clerk's desk a little while ago.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I should offer my apology to the Senate for having brought upon it the affliction of the last hour or so. I have had mingled emotions as I have listened to the Senator from Alabama. I think I owe him my thanks for including me with Mr. Raskob and the anti-Hefflin Democrats of Alabama in his excoriation. I have wondered as he went on whether he was pleading the cause of those who voted for him or those who were in need, or whether the two represent the same personnel.

The Senator from Oregon has aptly and accurately described the resolution which the Senator from Alabama has presented as being childish, foolish, and useless. For myself, I can not see any reason why the Senate should pursue a course of adopting resolutions which are childish, foolish, and useless. However, I have no desire to impede the prog-

ress of business in this session of the Senate. I have least of all any desire to enter upon competition with the Senator from Alabama for the championship of blah-blah in this Chamber, and I do not wish him to be wasting his time or that of the Senate in the few weeks which are yet remaining to him here with us.

"We shall meet, but we shall miss him," but in the meantime I am willing to withdraw my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I appreciate the confession made by the Senator from New Hampshire, and I forgive him. [Laughter.]

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14675) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the senior Senator from Utah yield to his colleague?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not yield for any other business.

Mr. KING. I wanted to ask consideration of a motion to reconsider which has been pending here for months.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall ask my colleague to forego that for the time being.

Mr. President, following my request for the consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill, and the statement made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] in relation to an amendment he desired to propose to the bill, I stated that I had no authority of the committee to accede to the request of the Senator for unanimous consent if unanimous consent were asked for the offering of his proposed amendment.

I immediately went to the room of the Committee on Appropriations. A subcommittee of that committee was in session, and I asked the members of the subcommittee to give me their expression as to what attitude I should take in relation to the request of the Senator from Arkansas. All the members of the subcommittee who were present agreed that the proper thing to do was to accede to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Arkansas and have a vote upon his proposed amendment to the Interior Department appropriation bill.

That being the case, Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Arkansas that I shall not object to the unanimous-consent request which he made. I now renew my request that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14675) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I ask to add to that request the following: And that the rule may be suspended and that it shall be in order to consider the amendment which I now send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will report the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. Insert at the proper place in the bill the following words:

There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$25,000,000 (in addition to such sums as may be or may become available through voluntary contributions), to be made available and to be expended by the Red Cross for the purpose of supplying food to persons otherwise unable to procure the same.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KING. If the unanimous consent asked by my colleague shall be granted, and the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill, will that displace the naval bill, which has been partly considered to-day and upon which a vote must be had to-morrow?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will not.

Mr. KING. Then, as I assume, to-morrow, if desired, the naval bill will be before the Senate, and it can be amended by the Senate if amendments are offered?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REED. Is it not correct that any Senator by demanding the regular order can bring the Senate back to the consideration of the naval modernization bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Pending the request, I think I find an error in the technical description of the Red Cross. In the amendment which I have sent to the desk I desire to have a modification made by inserting before the words "Red Cross" the words "American National," so that it will read "American National Red Cross."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be modified as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I take for granted the amendment is for the purpose of granting general relief not only in the drought-stricken areas but throughout the country wherever the Red Cross shall find need for relief?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That is true.

Mr. BROOKHART. I was wondering if the Senator intentionally confined the amendment to food and not to clothing?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I did that intentionally, but the amendment will be subject to amendment if the unanimous consent is agreed to. The Senate will have control of it. There was some discussion of that with those whom I consulted.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Arkansas has correctly stated the parliamentary situation and the parliamentary rule that would be applied; but in order that there may be no misunderstanding, I would like to ask the Chair in the form of a parliamentary inquiry whether or not, if unanimous consent is granted and the amendment offered, the amendment would still be subject to any amendment that is germane to it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment would be subject to amendment when presented, in the opinion of the Chair.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah as modified by the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Chair lays before the Senate the Interior Department appropriation bill.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14675) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the next amendment be reported.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 61, line 7, to strike out "\$75,000" and insert "\$75,400," so as to read:

Northern Cheyennes and Arapahoes, Montana (art. 7, treaty of May 10, 1868, and agreement of February 28, 1877), \$75,400.

Mr. SMOOT. That is a salary increase.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, at the end of line 14, to strike out "\$445,000" and insert "\$449,500," so as to read:

Sioux of different tribes, including Santee Sioux of Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota (arts. 8 and 13, treaty of April 29, 1868, 15 Stat. 635, and act of February 28, 1877, 19 Stat. 254), \$449,500.

Mr. SMOOT. That is a salary increase.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 17, to strike out "\$571,300" and insert "\$576,200," so as to read:

In all, for said treaty stipulations, not to exceed \$576,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 13, after the word "automobiles," to strike out "\$259,000" and insert "\$262,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

For the support of the Osage Agency, and for necessary expenses in connection with oil and gas production on the Osage Reservation, Okla., including pay of necessary employees, the tribal attorney and his stenographer, one special attorney in tax and other matters, and pay of tribal officers; repairs to buildings, rent of quarters for employees, traveling expenses, printing, telegraphing and telephoning, and purchase, repair, and operation of automobiles, \$262,000, payable from funds held by the United States in trust for the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. All the amendments that have been agreed to thus far are increases in salary. As they come up I will announce whether they are salary increases or not.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 68, line 21, after the word "of," to strike out "\$93,000" and insert "\$93,500," and at the end of line 25 to strike out "\$45,000" and insert "\$45,500," so as to make the paragraph read:

The sum of \$93,500 is hereby appropriated out of the principal funds to the credit of the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians, the sum of \$48,000 of said amount for the benefit of the Ute Mountain (formerly Navajo Springs) Band of said Indians in Colorado, and the sum of \$45,500 of said amount for the Uintah, White River, and Uncompahgre Bands of Ute Indians in Utah, which sums shall be charged to said bands, and the Secretary of the Interior is also authorized to withdraw from the Treasury the accrued interest to and including June 30, 1931, on the funds of the said Confederated Bands of Ute Indians appropriated under the act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 934), and to expend or distribute the same for the purpose of administering the property of and promoting self-support among the said Indians, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

Mr. SMOOT. That is a salary increase.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

#### INVESTIGATION OF CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I dislike very much to interrupt the consideration of the pending appropriation bill, but a situation confronts the committee investigating campaign expenditures which seems to call for a recitation before the Senate of facts which seem at this time to make it quite essential that the committee excuse some 20 Pennsylvania witnesses who have been subpoenaed to appear before the committee to-morrow because of the lack of funds with which to meet whatever expenses might be occasioned by the presence of such witnesses.

On the 19th day of December I offered a resolution (S. Res. 381) which was a request for additional funds. Assurances have been given to the committee by Senate leaders ever since that time that there would be no difficulty, no reason to doubt but what additional money would be available; but it comes down to this last moment when, as I said, we are without the money to meet the expenses which will be occasioned by the presence of these witnesses, and I am at a loss to know what might be done other than to excuse the witnesses from appearances to-morrow.

I understand that the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate—and the chairman of the committee is present in the Chamber—has agreed to the holding of a meeting to-morrow morning. I wish the chairman might make known just what the plans of the committee are and what we might expect from it to-morrow.

Mr. DENEEN. Mr. President, the resolution introduced by the Senator from North Dakota was referred in due course to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I returned to the city at 1 o'clock on Friday last. Learning that Senator NYE's resolution had been referred to the committee, I called a meeting of the committee for Saturday morning at 11.30 o'clock. We were unable to secure a quorum. I called a meeting of the committee again for Monday last at 2.30 o'clock in the afternoon. Again we were unable to secure a quorum. There has been a vacancy on the committee. I requested that that vacancy be filled. I understand that it was filled to-day.

Thereupon a call was issued for the committee to meet at 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

We have polled the committee on a number of smaller matters, those regarding which there could be no controversy, but there was a misunderstanding recently about a resolution, so the committee adopted the course of acting as a committee rather than by having it polled.

The committee has expedited its work as rapidly as it could. The committee will meet to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock, and I take it a quorum will be present.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. NYE. Certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. I thought we had a meeting; and that the committee had authorized an appropriation of \$25,000. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] being present, he at first asked for \$50,000, but after some matters had been discussed he thought that \$25,000 was sufficient.

Mr. DENEEN. No; that was not the understanding of the committee. One of the members of the committee stated that he would favor an appropriation of \$25,000. There were not three members of the committee who would agree to that and therefore I considered it prudent to call the committee together. There were also differences about the time mentioned in the resolution for conducting the investigation. The resolution calls for an investigation which would run on during the next Congress. There is some difference of opinion I understand among members of the committee regarding this resolution. The difference of opinion has been stated to me personally rather than in the committee. We had only two members present at the time to which the Senator from Arkansas refers. The Senator from Arkansas was present Saturday, if I remember correctly, and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] was present on Monday. There were two members present on Saturday and two present on Monday, including myself.

Mr. CARAWAY. I thought I fully understood the Senator from Illinois. When I left the committee I thought it was agreed that \$25,000 was to be appropriated.

Mr. DENEEN. No.

Mr. CARAWAY. What was the agreement?

Mr. DENEEN. The statement was made by the Senator from Arkansas that he would favor, as I understand it, reporting an appropriation of \$25,000 and that was submitted to other members of the committee.

Mr. CARAWAY. I thought it was the final action. That was the amount with which the Senator from North Dakota, as I understood, had said he would be satisfied at this time.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, in view of the circumstances which prevailed at the time—and at the time I did not consider that an official meeting of the Committee to Audit and Control was being held, because, as I recall, there were only two members of it present at the time—I would say that under ordinary circumstances I would feel that an additional \$25,000 would be ample; but I understand that two amendments are to be proposed, amendments to the resolution under which our committee is operating which, if accepted and approved, would make necessary a larger amount than that suggested.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NYE. Certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. I entered the Chamber just as the Senator took the floor. My understanding is, as I heard the Senator from North Dakota make his statement, that he is desirous of excusing some of his witnesses.

Mr. NYE. Yes; in the absence of any further available funds the chairman of the committee would not want to take upon himself the responsibility of having witnesses appear and not being in a position to reimburse them for the expense to which they would be placed.

Mr. CARAWAY. I would like to suggest to the chairman of the committee that there is a quorum of the committee now on the floor of the Senate. No one would want to prevent the committee of the Senator from North Dakota from

going through with the examination. I hope there will be no question about it. I have no idea but what in five minutes the Senator can be given the assurance that he will have the money to conduct his examination. I may have misunderstood it, but I appeared in pursuance of a notice from the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control and we went over the matter, and I left with the understanding that the matter was closed, that the Senator from North Dakota was to be permitted to have \$25,000. I am sure the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control, from what he said in the committee, felt then as he does now. There is a quorum of the committee present on the floor of the Senate now and I shall be very glad to meet if the chairman will call a meeting of the committee now.

Mr. DENEEN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. NYE. Certainly.

Mr. DENEEN. The Senator from Arkansas has made a statement of his recollection of the meeting of Saturday last. There were but two members of the committee present, the Senator from Arkansas and myself. No action could be taken. In view of the statements made by the Senator from Arkansas, may I state that I conferred with him and with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] this afternoon and suggested to them that we have a meeting of the committee this afternoon, but the Senator from Arkansas said it would be inconvenient for him to meet this afternoon, and, therefore, to accommodate him, the meeting was called for to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock. I have no objection to calling a meeting this afternoon, but I think it fair to the committee to make this statement.

Mr. NYE. Might I suggest to the Senator from Illinois that such a meeting be held at this time and a report made back to the Senate this afternoon, so that the Senate may take action upon it. It would leave the investigating committee in a position to proceed to-morrow with a clean slate, feeling that it had been authorized to go ahead with these hearings.

Mr. DENEEN. I endeavored to have a meeting this afternoon and postponed it to meet the convenience of one of the members. I would be very glad to call a meeting or glad to have the Senate pass on the matter and take such action as it deems appropriate. The committee is not anxious to prevent a hearing on the matter.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, before I yield the floor, I should like to have the assurance that such a meeting would be held and that a report would be brought back to the Senate during this sitting of the Senate.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator from Illinois came to me a while ago and asked about a meeting of the committee, but I did not understand that this matter was involved; I thought it was about something else and paid no attention to it. I was attempting to agree with the Senator from North Dakota. I thought he ought to have whatever was reasonable in order to finish the investigation being conducted by his committee. There was a matter we discussed at that time that both of us decided was not involved in his investigation, and that \$25,000 was the amount which I thought should be provided. Evidently I did not understand the chairman of the committee, but now, if the chairman of the committee wants to do so, we can have a meeting in a few moments.

Mr. DENEEN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. NYE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. DENEEN. I may state that I did not inform the Senator from Arkansas that there were 22 witnesses who had been summoned here. The reason was that I did not receive that information until about half an hour ago, and had no information that any witnesses were to be here. The Senator from North Dakota called upon me about half an hour

ago and told me that 22 witnesses were here. I told him that I felt confident—

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I do not think I told the Senator that the witnesses were here, but that they had been subpoenaed to appear to-morrow.

Mr. DENEEN. I took it for granted that they would be here, having been subpoenaed. I explained the situation to him, that it was inconvenient for one of the members of the committee to be present, and that was the reason, and the only reason, why the meeting was put off until to-morrow.

Mr. NYE. Since the Senator whom the Senator from Illinois suggests was unable to be present is now present, would it not be possible for him to hold such a meeting as he has suggested this afternoon?

Mr. DENEEN. That would be perfectly agreeable to me if the Senators are here.

Mr. MOSES. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. NYE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to inquire how much longer the debate on this question will continue?

Mr. MOSES. The Senator from North Dakota yielded to me for one moment, and I want to put an end to this discussion, I hope now, by stating that if the committee meets informally on the floor and submits a report, it can not be considered to-day, because I shall object.

Mr. NYE. Then, Mr. President, the only thing the special committee on campaign expenditures can do is to notify the twenty-odd witnesses who have been subpoenaed to appear to-morrow that they are excused from appearing at that time. I desire now to make a motion that the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate be discharged—

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not want a motion to intervene at this time; I want to get through with the pending bill.

Mr. NYE. I am giving notice of a motion I shall make.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can enter his motion now.

Mr. NYE. I enter a motion, which I shall ask to have considered to-morrow upon the convening of the Senate, that the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate be discharged from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 381. I hope that, prior to that time, the committee will have met and submitted a report to the Senate upon the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from North Dakota will be entered.

Mr. BLACK and Mr. NORRIS addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah has the floor. To whom does he yield?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I want to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. NORRIS. Has the Senator from North Dakota formally entered his motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion has been entered.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well.

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. SMOOT. For what purpose?

Mr. BLACK. I do not want the Senator to yield to me. I want the floor as soon as there is a question before the Senate on which I may speak.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah has the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the Senate may resume the consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14675) making appropriations for the Department of the

Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 68, line 21, after the words "sum of," it is proposed to strike out "\$93,000" and insert "\$93,500."

#### ALABAMA SENATORIAL ELECTION

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to engage in any controversy with my colleague over the question which he has raised, but I do feel that, since charges have been made upon the floor with reference to the State which I have the honor in part to represent, it would neither be proper nor right for me to sit silent without any statement whatever. Each Senator, of course, is entitled to have and to express his own opinion, honestly entertained, upon questions concerning his State.

The statement has been made on the floor, in substance, that an election in my State has been stolen. That, of course, is an opinion. Any statement I may make is but an opinion. I desire to say, however, that, in my judgment, the election in Alabama was as fair as any election ever held in any State in the United States. That, of course, is my opinion, obtained from facts ascertained over the State and from a participation in that campaign.

It also would not be proper to permit the inference to be left that there is any effort upon the part of the Democrats of Alabama to prevent a full, fair, and impartial investigation of that election. There is no such desire, either expressed or implied. As a matter of fact, the Democratic executive committee of Alabama has unanimously adopted a resolution inviting the Senate committee to make such investigation as it sees fit with reference to the election held in that State. In addition to that, the Democratic candidate for the United States Senate has likewise joined in requesting the Senate committee to make a full and fair investigation of both sides in the Alabama election.

As I have said, it is not my intention nor is it my purpose to engage in any controversy on the floor of the Senate with reference to the facts charged, except to say that the people of Alabama believe in fair elections; they conduct fair elections; the laws of the State amply provide for protection to every candidate and to every party.

So far as I am concerned, I favor fair elections in every State in the Union, and if there is a question with reference to an election where a Senator is involved I do not object to an investigation in my own State nor to an investigation in any other State. We should have investigations where charges are made. However, I should consider it wholly improper on my part in this body, which would be compelled to pass upon a contest if a contest should be made, to attempt to go into any of the facts surrounding the election in my State. I do not believe that that should be done, because if the Senate is later to determine upon a contest they should do so as fair and impartial judges, each Senator determining for himself upon the evidence which is presented; not upon opinion but upon substantial evidence, whether or not a contest has been sustained, and who has been selected to represent Alabama in the United States Senate. I do not want any candidate in my State to have a single vote to which that candidate is not entitled.

I would not have a single vote for any candidate or for any party which was not fairly and honestly cast for that candidate or that party. Any other position would be contrary to the first principles of good citizenship and good government; but I do not think it would be either proper or right for me, as one of the representatives of Alabama, without desiring or intending to engage in any controversy, to sit silently by and allow the statement to go unchallenged that an election had been stolen in Alabama. It was an opinion when expressed, and an opinion expressed by me would likewise have the same effect. Neither could be based upon all the evidence with reference to any election in 67 counties.

As I said in the beginning, while my colleague has stated that he believes the election was stolen, I am just as firmly

convinced that the election was fair, and that when the investigation shall be conducted it will be so found beyond all shadow of doubt. There are 67 counties in Alabama, and I think that after the committee has investigated, as I hope it will, it will be able to report that Alabamians believe in fair elections and Alabamians conduct fair elections.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. CARAWAY. I just came in. I am a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and I wish to ask has a contest been filed?

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I do not understand that as yet there is a contest, but I have understood from statements made that there might be a contest. That is the reason I took the position that it would not be right either for me or anyone else—I do not know whether it would be proper, according to the rules of the Senate, or not—to attempt to argue the facts if a contest is to be filed, and to present those facts by hearsay before the judges who may later be called upon to determine who was elected to the Senate from Alabama.

Mr. President, I send to the desk, and ask to have read, a statement appearing in Alabama newspapers on yesterday, being an interview by the Hon. W. C. Davis, who is at present the Lieutenant Governor of Alabama. Mr. Davis was a candidate for Governor of Alabama on the Democratic ticket but he was defeated in the Democratic primaries. This is a statement which is attributed to Mr. Davis in yesterday's Alabama newspapers with reference to the election. I desire the paper read at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read, as requested.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the newspaper statement first be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

ELECTION PROBE IN ALABAMA "COLD TRAIL," SAYS W. C. DAVIS—  
 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR TELLS AARHUS THIS STATE NOT LIKE  
 PENNSYLVANIA

The special Senate committee on investigation of senatorial campaign expenditures and the functions of that committee might be necessary in States like Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Colorado; anything that conduces to fair elections is desirable and some States may need it, but in Alabama the committee is "on a cold trail."

Lieut. Gov. W. C. Davis so stated yesterday to P. L. Aarhus, representative of the special committee, when Mr. Aarhus sought and obtained an interview with the lieutenant governor, who was a candidate for governor in the Democratic primary last year.

Asked concerning the interview between himself and Mr. Aarhus which was reported to have taken place, Lieutenant Governor Davis said he had been interviewed by him and had expressed his views to Mr. Aarhus as already indicated.

The committee representative then proceeded to ask him some specific questions, Mr. Davis said, and to these queries he replied that the best answer he could give as to his feelings regarding the Democratic primary was that he was one of the "victims," and accepted the results, thereafter doing all he could to carry its mandate into effect and elect the Democratic nominees.

Mr. Aarhus then told him he "might have to subpoena him," the lieutenant governor stated to which he replied that would be all right with him and that he would answer any question the committee might see fit to ask him.

"I told him," he added, "that the elections of the past year in Alabama were as fair as men can hold, though slight irregularities might have occurred here and there as they always do; and that there is nothing concerning them that I or anyone else can complain of."

Mr. Davis also told Mr. Aarhus that the person who was principally responsible for the committee representative's coming to Alabama, Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN, is the man "we all wanted to beat," adding: "We were proud to do it, and did not take any unfair means to do it."

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, there is one part of that statement to which I agree, and that is where Mr. Davis says he is one of the victims. He is. In my judgment, he was nominated in the primary for governor.

I do not think there is any doubt about his having been nominated. I believe that he believes in his heart that he

was nominated. Of course I know Mr. Davis. He is a very fine fellow. He had to mortgage his house to help make his campaign. He was very much in distress when it was over. The influences that fought me did not want Mr. Davis to be sore about the situation. I canvassed the State as it has not been canvassed in my lifetime. There never have been such crowds to hear a public man speak as the crowds that came to hear me. As I said before, I was speaking to crowds of three and four thousand when none of the opposition could muster over 200, perhaps three or four hundred. I spoke in the auditorium at Birmingham to 10,000 people. In the same auditorium, a few days before that, all of the State candidates and some of the county candidates spoke; and they had 224 people by actual count. The opposition ticket to me was defeated outright long before the election.

Since my colleague has gone into this matter—this is the first time I have ever broached the subject on the floor of the Senate—this investigation will disclose that in many places the ballot-box burglars boasted that they were going to steal the election from me. I myself was told by one or two men in high office that I probably would be elected, but that I would not get the election. I asked one of them, "What do you mean—that they will steal it?" He said, "Yes."

Mr. President, is it no serious thing to steal the election from a Senator? If they get to where they can manipulate your ballot box, good-bye! I believe this investigation will disclose the most secretive method that has ever been disclosed, and the most dangerous one to the life of the Republic. It was not done out in the open. It was done in a masterful way, and in secret.

My colleague may be of the opinion that Bankhead was elected. I do not see how he can be of that opinion in view of what he saw in physical appearances before him every day, all over the States, for three months—three months. For the last three weeks of the campaign I was addressing these audiences out in the State of three and four thousand, 10,000 in Birmingham, 12,000 in Montgomery, and 10,000 at Mobile. I polled the audiences for three weeks. When I finished I said, "All of you who are going to vote for me hold up your hands"; and you never saw the like of the hands that went up—practically everybody. Then I said, "All of you who are going to vote for Mr. BANKHEAD hold up your hands"; and frequently there were none; sometimes one; never over a half dozen; less than a hundred in three weeks. That is what occurred in my State.

I am not reflecting upon the people of Alabama. I love them and I am defending them. I am defending their right to cast their ballots as they choose and have them counted as cast. That is all I am asking.

What do you suppose Mr. Bankhead said when he asked for this investigation? That request for this investigation did not come from his heart. It was like Mr. Davis's statement, made for the purpose of keeping down an investigation. Do you not know that that statement does not sound like it wants an investigation, although it says it does? All this is done to keep you from backing me and having an investigation. They want to cover up this thing. They want to say to you, "Why, Bankhead himself is asking for it." Yes; he is, with a vengeance—and the others down there. "Why, even Davis says he is defeated." Yes; he said that after the primary; but in the first speech he made he was so mad that he never even mentioned the name of the candidate who beat him in the primary, or who got the benefit of the choice, nor Bankhead's name.

Mr. Bankhead, in his statement to the committee, if I recall correctly, said—listen to this: "Senator HEFLIN had representatives in the ballot box wherever he had a known follower." What do you think of that? A candidate is entitled to representation in every box. In many boxes I had no representation; and at many boxes the watchers were not permitted to stand behind the man who called off the tickets and watch to see if he was calling them off properly.

Here is just an incident. I am not going into the details. The daughter of a former chief justice of the supreme court of my State wrote me a letter the other day in Birmingham, the home of my colleague. She said that when she voted her number was 330, and the returning officer returned 167 votes polled at that place. It was a big box, and she voted, and her number was 330.

I am not reflecting on the people of my State. God bless them! They stood by me and elected me against all the machinery that could be had. They even marshaled every candidate for Congressman and my colleague, 11 of them on the stump; and over that State such a tidal wave of the party has never swept. Why, I spoke one night at Sylacauga, and my colleague spoke 17 miles away from there at Good Water. I addressed 3,500 people, and he had 243. I had them counted, and had the message sent to me. That is what went on in the State.

I know what has transpired. All I want is an investigation. If Mr. Bankhead says he wants it, then why not have it? I do not think he wants it. I do not think Bill Davis wants it. Of course, it is all over with Bill Davis, and he is one of the victims. He told the truth in that statement. He is one of the victims.

Senators, they used expressions like this: "HEFLIN is going to win. You can not keep him from winning." "That is all right. We are going to elect him. You cast the votes, and we will count them." We will show that.

Since this has been gone into, let me tell you what was said to a former member of the legislature of my State after the election of 1928. I have said here before that they stole the election for Al Smith in Alabama, and they did. In my judgment, if the people had just been let alone, every Southern State would have gone against Smith—every one. But this member of the legislature, who supported Hoover against Smith, was in Montgomery in the Exchange Hotel, talking to a Democrat from south Alabama, and a gentleman walked up and shook hands with this fellow and said, "My hat is off to you. You saved the State. You carried it for Smith." This fellow said, "Yes; I guess you know we had to steal it."

Mr. President, so help me God, I am going to have my State done with ballot-box thieves; and I am not reflecting upon the people of my State. I am fighting for them. I want the men and women who went to the polls to have their votes counted as they were cast. If the count discloses that I was defeated, I will accept it manfully; but until the facts show it I will not believe that I did not defeat John Bankhead by 100,000 majority.

No, Mr. President; I am not reflecting upon the people of my State. The people of my State believe in fair elections, and I am going to help to get them. I believe we can convict 100 men in one county. I will not call the name of the county, but I believe that we can convict a hundred of them.

What would you think if I were to tell you that they marked their ticket before they handed it to the voter in some places? An honest voter, with our emblem over in the righthand corner and theirs in the left, goes in there and marks his ticket, and folds it up and hands it in; and when they take it out they say, "Look there! He has voted both tickets. Therefore you can not count that ballot." I tell you that that was done in my State. Is that a fair election?

The people in my State do not approve that sort of thing. I do not approve it. If they had defeated me honestly, they would have been rejoicing all over the State next day; but do you know what the situation was? It was like Sunday. Everything was quiet. There was no rejoicing anywhere. I asked a man, "How do you account for that?" He said, "Did you ever see a fellow going down the street with stolen goods hollering, saying he had them?" They knew they had stolen goods.

Mr. President, I am doing this in the interest of clean and fair elections. If you go into this thing, you will have some things disclosed to you that you do not know about in politics. You will have some things disclosed to you that will be of value in 1932 in the presidential campaign.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am not projecting myself into this controversy; but I wish to ask a question, because I have read the resolution under which the Nye committee has been functioning. I seriously doubt if it has the authority to impound the ballots and count them, and I desire to call the Senator's attention to that. If he wants the ballots counted he had better ask for authority to do it, because I do not think the Nye committee has any authority to do it.

Mr. HEFLIN. I thank the Senator. I have thought about that to some extent. I think myself they have the authority, but the Senator may be right. If they have not the authority, I understand that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] will probably offer an amendment giving them the authority. They ought to have the authority to go into every ballot box everywhere where there was fraud and corruption.

The idea of empowering the committee to trail fraud and corruption to the ballot box, and stop there. It is ridiculous. If there is fraud and corruption in the box, the committee ought to be permitted to go into the box.

Mr. President, the ballot box is the ark of the covenant in our political affairs, and if people can tamper with that and nominate men and elect men by methods which are crooked and corrupt, we have reached a dangerous point in the life of our country.

I am asking for a clean and fair election in my State. I know how that State went. I have canvassed it for 30 years. I have never had such multitudes as I had in the last campaign. There has never been a campaign like it, where the verdict was foretold as clearly as it was in my State.

Let me bring this to the attention of the Senate before I take my seat: In 1920, when I was a candidate in the primaries, the newspaper boys wrote down there, as they do in the various States, to find out just what was going to happen in the primary. They prognosticated my nomination. They said they had consulted various sources, and that I would be nominated. I was nominated. During the last primary they did the same thing, and they prognosticated my nomination. Even Mr. Barger said that I would win as certainly as that the sun rises in the east and sets in the west. And then my opponent turned up with 50,000 majority!

Senators, let me tell you something about that ballot-box bunch in my State. I am not reflecting upon the people of my State, only upon those who behind the scenes secretly stole the election from the people of my State. They are the people about whom I am talking. You will find out something about them and their tactics when you make this investigation.

If this investigation does not disclose that the election was stolen by from 50,000 to 100,000, I will be the worst-mistaken man in the world. They could have given this man 75,000 majority just as easily as they gave him 50,000. It is said that they intended to give him but 10,000, but they were afraid that if I investigated I would get behind 10,000. Then the suggestion came, "If you make it 50,000, Senator HEFLIN will just drop it and will not go behind it." But they do not know me. I know they could make it 50,000 as easily as they could make it 10,000, and I know as well as I know anything that I won that election in Alabama and won it by the biggest majority any Senator ever received in that State. I won it over Raskob's money, and you will find a chunk of it down there that will startle you. You will find him mixed up in the primary in my State. Talk about owning the party! His edict went forth that I was to be read out of the party in Alabama, and they read me out. Then I took the cause to the people, and there has never been such a response amongst the masses in my lifetime as I had in Alabama. Then it winds up by this man

getting 50,000 majority, a man who was supported by the Power Trust. You will find something interesting along that line if you make this investigation.

Mr. President, I must tell a story. Mr. Bankhead said, "Come on with the investigation. Go all around and investigate." Even my colleague says he wants a thorough investigation. I thank him from the bottom of my heart for his enthusiastic cooperation! [Laughter.]

Old Truman, a fine old negro from Hot Springs, Ark., told me about a negro who lived down in an open field by himself. He had a cabin with one room to it. A farmer missed a shoat weighing 90 pounds. They searched high and low and could not find it. Finally, the sheriff said to his deputy, "Let's go over to old Rastus's house. Do you reckon he could have stolen it?" The deputy said, "He may have." They went over there and found Rastus sitting in the middle of the floor rocking a little pine cradle. He had quilts tucked in at head, foot, and sides and he was sitting there rocking it:

Little baby, don't you cry;  
You'll be an angel by and by.

They walked in and said: "Rastus, Mr. Jones lost a shoat, and we are looking for it."

He said: "Dere you go accusin' the old nigger of stealing. That's mighty hard on him. But I welcomes a search. Just go ahead and search around all you please. It hurts my heart to think you accuse me like that, because I don't believe in stealing at all. But go ahead and make your search, gentlemen, just go ahead." They went around and searched in the closets and around the house, but they did not find the hog. They came up and said: "What have you in that cradle?" He said: "It's my baby, and he's got pneumonia. If the air hits him, he's gone. I can't let the air hit him." They said: "Let's see him." He said: "No, sir. The minute you put the air to him he's gone." They said: "Well, we are going to see him." He said: "Well, don't let me see it. I don't want to see my baby die. Let me get out of here." While they were pulling the quilts back old Rastus beat it across the field, moving with the speed of the wind. But when they pulled the quilts back, there was old Rastus's baby, Mr. Jones's shoat. [Laughter.]

Make this investigation in Alabama and we will take the quilts off of their baby.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. CARAWAY. I knew that old negro. He came from over in Alabama, and he had just been in Arkansas a week. [Laughter.]

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14675) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 68, line 21.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 25, to strike out "\$45,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$45,500," so as to read:

The sum of \$93,500 is hereby appropriated out of the principal funds to the credit of the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians, the sum of \$48,000 of said amount for the benefit of the Ute Mountain (formerly Navajo Springs) Band of said Indians in Colorado, and the sum of \$45,500 of said amount for the Uintah, White River, and Uncompahgre Bands of Ute Indians in Utah, which sums shall be charged to said bands, and the Secretary of the Interior is also authorized to withdraw from the Treasury the accrued interest to and including June 30, 1931, on the funds of the said Confederated Bands of Ute Indians appropriated under the act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 934), and to expend or distribute the same for the purpose of administering the property of and promoting self-support among the said Indians, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this paragraph shall be expended on road construction unless preference shall be given to Indians in the employment of labor on all roads constructed from the sums herein appropriated from the funds of the Confederated Bands of Utes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Reclamation," on page 77, line 18, after the figures "1931," to strike out "for cleaning up Jackson Lake Reservoir in Wyoming, in cooperation with the National Park Service, \$50,000, either by direct expenditure or b. transfer to the National Park Service to be available until expended: *Provided*, That the expenditure from the reclamation fund for such clean-up shall not be charged as a part of the construction or operation and maintenance cost payable by the water users under the project, but shall be offset and recouped from revenues from the rentals of storage from the reservoir: *Provided further*," so as to read:

Minidoka project, Idaho: For operation and maintenance, reserved works, \$29,000; continuation of construction gravity extension unit, \$250,000, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose for the fiscal year 1931.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, I want to offer just a word of explanation about this amendment.

It will be observed that this appropriation is to be employed in removing the dead timber from Jackson Lake. When the bill was under consideration by the committee this item was stricken out on my motion. I had no objection at the time, and certainly have no objection now, to the removal of this timber; in fact, this work should have been done many years ago, and by those who were responsible for the situation. I did object to the plan and the language in the item as proposed.

For the information of the Senate, I will explain briefly. Originally Jackson Lake was both in itself and in its surroundings one of the gems among Rocky Mountain lakes. The present situation was developed through the action of promoters of an irrigation project located across the line in the State of Idaho. In order to increase the storage capacity of the lake, the water line was raised to a much higher level than the original line. As a result of this hundreds of acres of beautiful timber, which in its original state grew down to the very edge of the lake, were flooded and killed. This timber has since fallen, and it is estimated that a thousand acres of dead, water-soaked timber continues to drift back and forth across the lake, like a vast, unsightly derelict, desecrating the landscape; it is an offense to the eye and outrage not only upon those who live in that section but upon thousands of visitors who annually pass that way.

This is the result of reclamation work, and it would seem to be the duty of those responsible for the evil to correct the same. It will be noted on page 77, line 18, that the provision in the bill as it came from the House was as follows:

For cleaning up Jackson Lake Reservoir in Wyoming, in cooperation with the National Park Service, \$50,000, either by direct expenditure or by transfer to the National Park Service, to be available until expended: *Provided*, That the expenditure from the reclamation fund for such clean-up shall not be charged as a part of the construction or operation and maintenance cost payable by the water users under the project, but shall be offset and recouped from revenues from the rentals of storage from the reservoir.

In this connection it may be worth while to state that Jackson Lake, while very near to the Teton National Park, is not included in the park. Moreover, Mr. President, the people of Wyoming are strongly opposed to any further park extension in our State. They believe that they have contributed not merely generously, but magnificently, to the Nation's system of playgrounds. Because of the definite views on this subject held by the people of Wyoming, and because of what occurred in a recent discussion of the question, I am unwilling to permit any action here that would becloud the issue or prejudice the situation in favor of park extension.

Since action was taken by the committee I have had an opportunity to discuss the matter personally with the Hon. Horace M. Albright, Director of our National Park Service, and he has assured me the language used was without significance, except that the Reclamation Bureau had requested him to cooperate in the removal of this timber purely on the ground of economic results in prosecuting the work.

In the light of this information, I now withdraw my objection, and move that the two amendments, which are correlated, the one on page 77, beginning at line 18 and extending to the first two words in line 3 on page 78, and the amendment on page 97, beginning with line 18 and extending to line 23, be restored to the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, so that I may understand the request of the Senator, if we disagree to this amendment on page 77, does the Senator desire that we disagree to the amendment on page 97?

Mr. KENDRICK. I do. The two amendments are correlated.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I ask that the Senate disagree to the amendment on page 77.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator from Wyoming a question. I have had some protests against what is claimed to be the unfair and progressive movement upon the part of the National Park Service to incorporate within some Federal park territory within the State of Wyoming. I understand that quite recently an effort was made to have incorporated within a Federal park some territory which the people of the Senator's State were very much opposed to. Is that involved at all in this matter?

Mr. KENDRICK. If it is not involved, there was good reason for the assumption that it was involved, and that is why I had the provision stricken out in the committee when we were considering it. The senior Senator from Utah has moved to have the provision reinstated, and I ask that the motion be agreed to.

Mr. KING. The statement made to me by the Director of the National Park Service is, in effect, that the only purpose in asking the cooperation of the park authorities is because of the fact that they are situated very near the lake involved, and the object to be attained is to secure economical results in removing the timber.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator just one question? He spoke about the raising of the level of the lake causing the destruction of the timber. Was that a Government operation?

Mr. KENDRICK. It was originally a private operation. It was originated by a private company and later on the Government took it over and it is now a Government reclamation project; that is to say, the reservoir provides water for people in another State. As I have already said, it constituted for years and years an imposition on the people of my State. It ought never to have been allowed to stay there more than long enough to take off the timber. I am informed by no less a person than the superintendent of parks that it is his judgment that if it had been done in advance, the timber could have been removed for a cost not to exceed \$10,000. As I have already said, it should have been done years ago. I am willing for it to be done now with that kind of an understanding.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KENDRICK. Did the Senator from Utah move to reinstate the item?

Mr. SMOOT. No; we merely disagreed to the amendment. By disagreeing to the amendment the item is reinstated. The same amendment on page 97 should be rejected. Let it be stated now.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 97, line 17, after the word "work," the committee proposes to strike out "including not exceeding \$50,000 for cleaning up Jackson Lake in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation, either by direct expenditure or by transfer to the reclamation fund for expenditure under the direction of the Commissioner of Reclamation for the purposes for which appropriated, said amount for such clean-up to remain available until expended, \$76,100" and insert "\$26,220."

Mr. BRATTON. That amendment should be disagreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I desire that that amendment be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 78, line 9, to strike out "\$329,000" and insert "\$279,000," so as to make the proviso read:

*Provided*, That not to exceed \$50,000 from the power revenues shall be available during the fiscal year 1932 for the operation of the commercial system and not to exceed \$125,000 from power revenues shall be available during the fiscal year 1932 for continuation of construction, south side division; in all, \$279,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, line 18, to reduce the total appropriation from the reclamation fund from \$6,971,000 to \$6,921,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Geological Survey, salaries," on page 86, at the end of line 4, to strike out "\$150,000" and insert "\$150,080," so as to read:

For the Director of the Geological Survey and other personal services in the District of Columbia, \$150,080.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 87, line 7, to increase the appropriation for topographic surveys in various portions of the United States from \$780,000 to \$790,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, line 5, to increase the appropriation for continuation of the investigation of the mineral resources of Alaska from \$84,500 to \$85,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, line 15, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$711,000" and insert "\$720,000," so as to read:

For gaging streams and determining the water supply of the United States, the investigation of underground currents and artesian wells, and the preparation of reports upon the best methods of utilizing the water resources, \$672,000; for operation and maintenance of the Lees Ferry, Ariz., gaging station and other base-gaging stations in the Colorado River drainage, \$48,000; in all, \$720,000, of which amount not to exceed \$180,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 89, at the end of line 10, to strike out "\$199,000" and insert "\$200,000," so as to read:

For the examination and classification of lands with respect to mineral character, water resources, and agricultural utility as required by the public land laws and for related administrative operations; for the preparation and publication of land classification maps and reports; for engineering supervision of power permits and grants under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior; and for performance of work of the Federal Power Commission, \$200,000, of which amount not to exceed \$125,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, line 4, after the word "thereto," to strike out "\$270,000" and insert "\$275,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

For the enforcement of the provisions of the acts of October 20, 1914 (U. S. C., title 48, sec. 435), October 2, 1917 (U. S. C., title 30, sec. 141), February 25, 1920 (U. S. C., title 30, sec. 181), and March 4, 1921 (U. S. C., title 48, sec. 444), and other acts relating to the mining and recovery of minerals on Indian and public lands and naval petroleum reserves; and for every other expense incident thereto, including supplies, equipment, expenses of travel and subsistence, the construction, maintenance, and repair of necessary camp buildings and appurtenances thereto, \$275,000, of which amount not to exceed \$40,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 91, line 11, before the word "mapping," to strike out "topographic," so as to read:

During the fiscal year 1932, upon the request of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to furnish aerial photographs required for mapping projects, in so far as the furnishing of such photographs will be economical to the Federal Government and does not conflict with military or naval operations or the other parts of the regular training program of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps flying services, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to reimburse the War or Navy Department for the cost of making the

photographs, such cost to be confined to the actual cost of gasoline, oil, film, paper, chemicals, and the labor performed in developing the photographic negatives and the printing of copies of photographs, and the per diem expenses of the personnel authorized by law, together with such incidental expenses as care and minor repairs to plane and transportation of personnel to and from projects, and the War Department or the Navy Department, on the request of the Department of the Interior, is authorized to furnish copies to any State, county, or municipal agency cooperating with the Federal Government in the mapping project for which the photographs were taken. In the event that the Director of the Geological Survey deems it advantageous to the Government, the Geological Survey is authorized to contract with civilian aerial photographic concerns for the furnishing of such photographs.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 92, at the end of line 15, to increase the total appropriation for the Geological Survey from \$3,132,740 to \$3,158,320.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the two amendments which were rejected make it necessary that this total be corrected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will correct the total.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Park Service," on page 93, line 8, after the figures "1883," to strike out "\$167,400" and insert "\$167,770," so as to make the paragraph read:

For the Director of the National Park Service and other personal services in the District of Columbia, including accounting services in checking and verifying the accounts and records of the various operators, licensees, and permittees conducting utilities and other enterprises within the national parks and monuments, and including the services of specialists and experts for investigations and examinations of lands to determine their suitability for national park and national monument purposes and members of the commission appointed under the provisions of the act of February 21, 1925 (43 Stat. 959): *Provided*, That such specialists and experts may be employed for temporary service at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior to correspond to those established by the classification act of 1923, as amended, and without reference to the civil service act of January 16, 1883, \$167,770, of which amount not to exceed \$22,500 may be expended for the services of field employees engaged in examination of lands and in developing the educational work of the National Park Service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 94, line 2, after the word "including," to strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$3,100"; in line 10, after the word "work," to strike out "\$53,600" and insert "\$53,900"; and at the end of line 14, to strike out "\$61,600" and insert "\$61,900," so as to make the paragraph read:

Acadia National Park, Me.: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including \$3,100 for George B. Dorr as superintendent, \$3,000 for temporary clerical services for investigation of titles and preparation of abstracts thereof of lands donated to the United States for inclusion in the Acadia National Park, and not exceeding \$3,100 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, \$53,900; for the construction of physical improvements, \$8,000, of which not exceeding \$1,600 shall be available for one ranger cabin, \$600 for a shelter cabin, and \$5,800 for improvements to the Homan's residence; in all, \$61,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 94, line 20, after the word "work," to strike out "\$10,300" and insert "\$10,420," and in line 23, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$20,120," so as to make the paragraph read:

Bryce Canyon National Park, Utah: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including not exceeding \$300 for the maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with the general park work, \$10,420; for construction of physical improvements, \$9,700, of which \$5,000 shall be available for a dormitory, \$2,500 for a mess house, \$1,200 for employees' quarters; in all, \$20,120.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 95, line 5, after the word "work," to strike out "\$93,000" and insert "\$93,140," and in line 11, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$150,100" and insert "\$150,240," so as to read:

Carlsbad Caverns National Park, N. Mex.: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including \$5,000 for water-supply investigations and necessary tests and not exceeding \$800 for the maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-

carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, \$93,140; for construction of physical improvements, \$57,100, including \$25,000 for surface structure for passenger elevator, and not exceeding \$22,100 for the construction of buildings, of which not exceeding \$3,600 shall be available for an equipment shed, \$8,600 for three employees' quarters, and \$5,200 for a bunk house; in all, \$150,240.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 95, line 22, after the name "Crater Lake National Park," to strike out "\$52,300" and insert "\$52,720," and on page 96, line 3, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$106,900" and insert "\$107,320," so as to read:

Crater Lake National Park, Oreg.: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including not exceeding \$2,000 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, and including \$1,000 for the purchase from Will G. Steel of historical scrapbooks relating to Crater Lake National Park, \$52,720; for construction of physical improvements, \$54,600, of which not exceeding \$30,000 shall be available for electric power development, and including not exceeding \$7,500 for the construction of buildings, of which \$2,200 shall be available for an employees' quarters, \$2,000 for a comfort station, \$3,000 for an addition to a utility unit; in all, \$107,320.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 96, line 5, after the word "maintenance," to strike out "\$17,100" and insert "\$17,220," and in line 8, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$21,900" and insert "\$22,020," so as to read:

General Grant National Park, Calif.: For administration, protection, and maintenance, \$17,220; for construction of physical improvements, \$4,800, of which not exceeding \$1,900 shall be available for a comfort station; in all, \$22,020.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 96, line 18, after the word "work," to strike out "\$210,000" and insert "\$210,740," and in line 22, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$256,500" and insert "\$257,240," so as to make the paragraph read:

Glacier National Park, Mont.: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including necessary repairs to the roads from Glacier Park Station through the Blackfeet Indian Reservation to various points in the boundary line of the Glacier National Park and the international boundary, including not exceeding \$1,300 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, \$210,740; for construction of physical improvements, \$46,500, including not exceeding \$19,300 for the construction of buildings, of which not exceeding \$3,500 shall be available for a ranger station, \$6,600 for four comfort stations, \$1,500 for a shelter cabin; in all, \$257,240.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 97, line 4, after the word "work," to strike out "\$131,500" and insert "\$132,520," and in line 11, to strike out "\$172,200" and insert "\$173,220," so as to make the paragraph read:

Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz.: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including not exceeding \$2,500 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, \$132,520; for construction of physical improvements, \$40,700, including not exceeding \$27,400 for the construction of buildings, of which not exceeding \$11,700 shall be available for three employees' quarters, \$1,900 for a comfort station, \$1,300 for completion of a ranger station, \$3,500 for a bunkhouse, \$3,500 for a mess house, \$1,500 for a barn and equipment shed; in all, \$173,220.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 97, in line 24, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$76,750" and insert "\$26,870," so as to make the paragraph read:

Grand Teton National Park, Wyo.: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including not exceeding \$650 for the maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, including not exceeding \$50,000 for cleaning up Jackson Lake in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation either by direct expenditure or by transfer to the reclamation fund, for expenditure under the direction of the commissioner of reclamation for the purposes for which appro-

riated, said amount for such clean up to remain available until expended, \$76,100; for construction of physical improvements, \$650; in all, \$26,870.

Mr. SMOOT. That total should be corrected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will be authorized to correct the total.

The next amendment was, on page 98, line 15, after the word "work," to strike out "\$34,700" and insert "\$35,000," and at the end of line 19 to strike out "\$54,600" and insert "\$54,900," so as to make the paragraph read:

Hawaii National Park: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including not exceeding \$600 for the maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, \$35,000; for construction of physical improvements, \$19,900, of which not exceeding \$6,600 shall be available for two employees' quarters, \$3,800 for an administration building, \$4,500 for a residence for the United States commissioner; in all, \$54,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 98, line 25, after the word "work," to strike out "\$85,300" and insert "\$86,340," and on page 99, line 3, to strike out "\$89,300" and insert "\$90,340," so as to make the paragraph read:

Hot Springs National Park, Ark.: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including not exceeding \$1,830 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, \$86,340; for construction of physical improvements, \$4,000, of which \$3,500 shall be available for an employee's quarters; in all, \$90,340.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 99, line 9, after the word "work," to strike out "\$31,300" and insert "\$31,480," and in line 14 to strike out "\$50,300" and insert "\$50,480," so as to make the paragraph read:

Lassen Volcanic National Park, Calif.: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including not exceeding \$200 for the maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, \$31,480; for construction of physical improvements, \$19,000, including not exceeding \$3,300 for an employee's quarters, \$1,650 for an equipment shed, \$1,650 for a barn, \$8,900 for water and sewer systems, and not exceeding \$500 for continuation of a telephone line; in all, \$50,480.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 99, line 20, after the word "work," to strike out "\$53,000" and insert "\$53,200," and at the end of line 23 to strike out "\$57,300" and insert "\$57,500," so as to make the paragraph read:

Mesa Verde National Park, Colo.: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including not exceeding \$1,775 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, \$53,200; for construction of physical improvements, \$4,300, of which \$2,500 shall be available for employees' quarters, \$1,200 for an addition to the ranger's quarters; in all, \$57,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 99, line 25, after the word "maintenance," to strike out "\$28,000" and insert "\$28,120," and on page 100, line 2, to strike out "\$31,100" and insert "\$31,220," so as to make the paragraph read:

Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska: For administration, protection, and maintenance, \$28,120; for construction of physical improvements, \$3,100; in all, \$31,220.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 100, line 8, after the word "work," to strike out "\$137,600" and insert "\$138,020," and at the end of line 13, to strike out "\$195,000" and insert "\$195,420," so as to make the paragraph read:

Mount Rainier National Park, Wash.: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including not exceeding \$2,700 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, \$138,020; for construction of physical improvements, \$57,400, including not exceeding \$22,800 for the construction of buildings, of which not

exceeding \$1,200 shall be available for completion of a checking station, \$5,500 for two employees' quarters, \$14,800, for five comfort stations; in all, \$195,420.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 101, line 6, after the word "work," to strike out "\$95,000" and insert "\$95,500," and in line 11, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$118,800" and insert "\$119,300," so as to make the paragraph read:

Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo.: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including not exceeding \$2,100 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, \$95,500; for construction of physical improvements, \$23,800, including not exceeding \$16,800 for the construction of buildings, of which not exceeding \$4,400 shall be available for road camp buildings, \$4,800 for an employees' quarters, \$3,000 for two shelter cabins, \$2,000 for a ranger station; in all, \$119,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 101, line 18, after the word "work," to strike out "\$112,300" and insert "\$112,960," and in line 25, to strike out "\$156,900" and insert "\$157,560," so as to make the paragraph read:

Sequoia National Park, Calif.: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including not exceeding \$2,600 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, \$112,960; for construction of physical improvements, \$44,600, including not exceeding \$16,500 for the construction of buildings, of which not exceeding \$4,200 shall be available for an employees' quarters, \$2,700 for two comfort stations, \$4,800 for a ranger cabin, \$2,000 for an addition to the superintendent's residence, \$2,000 for completion of the administration building; in all, \$157,560.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 102, line 6, after the word "work," to strike out "\$18,000" and insert "\$18,180," and at the end of line 9, to strike out "\$25,200" and insert "\$25,380," so as to make the paragraph read:

Wind Cave National Park, S. Dak.: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including not exceeding \$800 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, \$18,180; for construction of physical improvements, \$7,200, including not exceeding \$3,000 for the construction of a mess house, \$3,500 for an employees' quarters, \$700 for a garage; in all, \$25,380.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 102, line 22, after the words "buffalo keepers," to strike out "\$462,800" and insert "\$466,580," and on page 103, at the end of line 6, to strike out "\$560,800" and insert "\$564,580," so as to make the paragraph read:

Yellowstone National Park, Wyo.: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including not exceeding \$7,700 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, not exceeding \$8,400 for maintenance of the road in the national forest leading out of the park from the east boundary, not exceeding \$7,500 for maintenance of the road in the national forest leading out of the park from the south boundary, and including feed for buffalo and other animals and salaries of buffalo keepers, \$466,580; for construction of physical improvements, \$98,000, including not exceeding \$59,000 for extension of water and sewer systems, not exceeding \$5,000 for auto camps, and not exceeding \$32,000 for the construction of buildings, of which not exceeding \$1,800 shall be available for a comfort station, \$2,300 for a mess house, \$1,700 for a bunk house, \$4,800 for an incinerator, \$4,000 for an addition to Lake Ranger Station, \$2,800 for a checking station, \$13,000 for two employees' quarters; in all, \$564,580.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have had a number of complaints—whether justified or not I do not pretend to state—with reference to the methods employed in handling the park, complaints as to extravagance and waste. There have been complaints alleging that charges have been too great and obstacles have been interposed to free access to the park; that concessions have been made, all of which it was contended were against the best interests of the public and harmful to the best use of the park for the great mass of the people. I want to ask my colleague whether the committee, in the consideration of the appropriation bill, ex-

amined into the appropriation and the justification for the very large amount asked?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to my colleague that this is the first intimation I have had that there was any complaint as to Yellowstone Park. We did not ask the director whether there had been any complaint. If I had known anything about it, I should have taken pleasure in asking him about it. But this is the first intimation I have had that there was complaint.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, will the Senator indicate the nature of the complaint?

Mr. KING. The complaints were that there were too many employees during the season; that persons who went into the park were denied privileges to which they thought they were entitled; that camping restrictions were too severe; that concessions were made which operated to the disadvantage of the general public that might desire to go there; that it was kind of a monopoly.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. With respect to the number of employees, they are of the hotel company and not of the Government.

Mr. KING. I am inclined to think some of the complaints ought to have been lodged rather against the transportation company. Indeed, some of them were. It was complained that concessions were given to the transportation company or companies showing a sort of favoritism.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course, the concessions are, as a matter of fact, a monopoly. I have, myself, been opposed to that policy, but it seems to be thoroughly determined and established and adhered to by the department.

Mr. KING. I think most of the complaints which have come to me—and they have been rather numerous—were based upon the theory that a monopoly existed, and there was a protest against it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 103, line 22, after the word "features," to strike out "\$324,000" and insert "\$327,440," and on page 104, at the end of line 11, to strike out "\$558,600" and insert "\$562,040," so as to make the paragraph read:

Yosemite National Park, Calif.: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including not exceeding \$3,100 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, not exceeding \$3,200 for maintenance of that part of the Wawona Road in the Sierra National Forest between the park boundary 2 miles north of Wawona and the park boundary near the Mariposa Grove of Big Trees, not exceeding \$2,000 for maintenance of the road in the Stanislaus National Forest Connecting the Tioga Road with the Hetch Hetchy Road near Mather Station, and including necessary expenses of a comprehensive study of the problems relating to the use and enjoyment of the Yosemite National Park and the preservation of its natural features, \$327,440; for construction of physical improvements, \$234,600, including not exceeding \$41,300 for the construction of buildings, of which not exceeding \$7,000 shall be available for a doctor's residence for the Lewis Memorial Hospital, \$7,000 for an employee's residence, \$4,800 for a dentist's residence, \$2,000 for a garage, \$4,800 for a bunk house, \$5,200 for two comfort stations, not exceeding \$7,800 for extension of telephone system, not exceeding \$80,000 for extension and improvement of electric system including a substation, and \$53,000 for development of Mariposa Grove, including water supply, to connect with near-by springs located on privately owned land within the Sierra National Forest, sewer and sanitation system, two comfort stations, and camp-ground development; in all, \$562,040.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 104, line 17, after the word "work," to strike out "\$41,000" and insert "\$41,480," and at the end of line 21 to strike out "\$54,100" and insert "\$54,580," so as to make the paragraph read:

Zion National Park, Utah: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including not exceeding \$1,200 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, \$41,480; for construction of physical improvements, \$13,100, including not exceeding \$8,200 for the construction of buildings, of which not exceeding \$5,000 shall be available for an employees' quarters, \$1,800 for a comfort station; in all, \$54,580.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 105, line 2, after the word "work," to strike out "\$66,500" and insert "\$66,920," and in line 8, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$165,400" and insert "\$165,820," so as to read:

National monuments: For administration, protection, maintenance, and preservation of national monuments, including not exceeding \$1,650 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the custodians and employees in connection with general monument work, \$66,920; for construction of physical improvements, \$98,900, of which not exceeding \$20,900 shall be available for six employees' quarters, \$4,000 for two comfort stations, \$40,000 for the erection of a cover over the Casa Grande Ruins, \$20,000 for two administration buildings, \$8,000 for four or more implement sheds, \$1,500 for a shelter cabin; in all, \$165,820.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of Education, salaries," on page 111, at the end of line 9, to strike out "\$280,000" and insert "\$284,500," so as to read:

For the Commissioner of Education and other personal services in the District of Columbia, \$284,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Government in the Territories, Territory of Alaska," on page 114, line 9, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$14,300" and insert "\$14,424," so as to read:

For incidental and contingent expenses of the offices of the governor and of the secretary of the Territory, clerk hire, not to exceed \$5,700; janitor service for the governor's office and the executive mansion, not to exceed \$3,000; traveling expenses of the governor while absent from the capital on official business and of the secretary of the Territory while traveling on official business under direction of the governor; repair and preservation of governor's house and furniture; for care of grounds and purchase of necessary equipment; stationery, lights, water, and fuel; in all, \$14,424, to be expended under the direction of the governor.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 116, line 22, after the figures "1932," to strike out the comma and "and no one other than the general manager of said railroad shall be paid an annual salary out of this fund of more than \$6,000," so as to read:

The Alaska Railroad: For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the authorized work of the Alaska Railroad, including maintenance, operation, and improvements of railroads in Alaska; maintenance and operation of river steamers and other boats on the Yukon River and its tributaries in Alaska; operation and maintenance of ocean-going or coastwise vessels by ownership, charter, or arrangement with other branches of the Government service, for the purpose of providing additional facilities for the transportation of freight, passengers, or mail, when deemed necessary, for the benefit and development of industries and travel affecting territory tributary to the Alaska Railroad; stores for resale; payment of claims for losses and damages arising from operations, including claims of employees of the railroad for loss and damage resulting from wreck or accident on the railroad, not due to negligence of the claimant, limited to clothing and other necessary personal effects used in connection with his duties and not exceeding \$100 in value; payment of amounts due connecting lines under traffic agreements; payment of compensation and expenses as authorized by section 42 of the injury compensation act approved September 7, 1916 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 793), to be reimbursed as therein provided, \$1,000,000, in addition to all amounts received by the Alaska Railroad during the fiscal year 1932, to continue available until expended; *Provided*, That not to exceed \$6,000 of this fund shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1932.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Territory of Hawaii," on page 117, line 7, after the word "secretary," to strike out "\$5,800; in all, \$15,800" and insert "\$6,000; in all, \$16,000," so as to read:

Governor, \$10,000; secretary, \$6,000; in all, \$16,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "St. Elizabeths Hospital," on page 118, line 12, after the word "grounds," to strike out "\$1,204,020" and insert "\$1,229,760," so as to read:

For support, clothing, and treatment in St. Elizabeths Hospital for the insane of insane persons from the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, insane inmates of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, persons charged with or convicted of crimes against the United States who are insane, all persons who

have become insane since their entry into the military and naval service of the United States, insane civilians in the quartermaster service of the Army, insane persons transferred from the Canal Zone who have been admitted to the hospital and who are indigent, American citizens legally adjudged insane in the Dominion of Canada whose legal residence in one of the States, Territories, or the District of Columbia it has been impossible to establish, insane beneficiaries of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, and insane beneficiaries of the United States Veterans' Bureau, including not exceeding \$27,000 for the purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent, purchasing agent, and general hospital business, and including not to exceed \$235,000 for repairs and improvements to buildings and grounds, \$1,229,760, including maintenance and operation of necessary facilities for feeding employees and others (at not less than cost), and the proceeds therefrom shall reimburse the appropriation for the institution; and not exceeding \$1,500 of this sum may be expended in the removal of patients to their friends, not exceeding \$1,500 in the purchase of such books, periodicals, and newspapers as may be required for the purposes of the hospital and for the medical library, and not exceeding \$1,500 for the actual and necessary expenses incurred in the apprehension and return to the hospital of escaped patients.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Freedmen's Hospital," on page 121, line 17, after the name "Secretary of the Interior," to strike out "\$197,000" and insert "\$202,060," and on page 122, line 6, after the name "Freedmen's Hospital," to strike out "\$387,000" and insert "\$392,060," so as to make the paragraph read:

For officers and employees and compensation for all other professional and other services that may be required and expressly approved by the Secretary of the Interior, \$202,060; for subsistence, fuel and light, clothing, to include white duck suits and white canvas shoes for the use of internes, and rubber surgical gloves, bedding, forage, medicine, medical and surgical supplies, surgical instruments, electric lights, repairs, replacement of X-ray apparatus, furniture, including not exceeding \$300 for the purchase of books, periodicals, and newspapers; and not to exceed \$1,200 for the special instruction of pupil nurses, and other absolutely necessary expenses, \$93,000; for a hospital addition for clinical activities, including necessary equipment, advertising for proposals, preparation of plans, and supervision of work of construction of said building, \$97,000; in all, for Freedmen's Hospital, \$392,060, of which amount one-half shall be chargeable to the District of Columbia and paid in like manner as other appropriations of the District of Columbia are paid.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. I offer the following committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The amendment was, on page 44, line 18, after the figures "\$271,375," to insert a colon and the following proviso:

*Provided*, That the unexpended balance of the appropriation contained in the second deficiency appropriation act, fiscal year 1930, for the construction of a girls' dormitory, including equipment, is hereby continued available until June 30, 1932.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 93, line 4, after the word "service," it is proposed to insert "subject to the civil service rules and regulations," and on page 93, in lines 7 and 8, to strike out "and without reference to the civil service act of January 16, 1883."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BRATTON. Let me ask the Senator to what service does the amendment apply?

Mr. SMOOT. To the National Park Service.

Mr. BRATTON. What is the effect of the amendment?

Mr. SMOOT. It simply puts those in that service under the civil service.

Mr. BRATTON. Does it put all officials of the National Park Service under the civil service law?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. I have a letter here from the department in which they state they desire that to be done.

Mr. KING. Why should they be put under the civil service?

Mr. SMOOT. I think all of them ought to be under the civil service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator wait just a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that all the committee amendments have not as yet been disposed of.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think we have completed the committee amendments. It is now quarter past 5, and—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was of the opinion—perhaps he is wrong—that on the first day of the consideration of the bill one or two amendments were passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BRATTON. That is quite true.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not know whether they have since been acted on or not.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah a question. I think there was an understanding with some Senators who are not now present that the Senator from Utah was not going to try to complete the bill to-night.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not going to do so.

Mr. NORRIS. When is the Senator going to move a recess?

Mr. SMOOT. I want to move a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow at this time.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no objection to that. If the committee amendments have been completed, this would be a good place to stop.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I am going to do, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well; but I thought from the way Senators were addressing the Chair that they were about to offer individual amendments.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true; but I was going to ask them to withhold the amendments in order that I might move a recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised that two amendments were passed over. The amendments passed over will be stated.

The first amendment passed over was, on page 29, at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "\$220,000," and insert "\$226,000," so as to read:

In all, for irrigation on Indian reservations, not to exceed \$226,000, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose for the fiscal year 1931, which is hereby continued available until June 30, 1932, reimbursable as provided in the act of August 1, 1914 (U. S. C., title 25, sec. 385).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 38, after line 16, to insert:

For continuing construction of the Wapato irrigation and drainage system, for the utilization of the water supply provided by the act of August 1, 1914 (38 Stat. 604), \$360,000, reimbursable as provided by said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Now, Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] has the floor.

Mr. BRATTON. I wish to offer an amendment about which I think there will be no controversy.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me say to the Senator that I told some of the Senators who have left the Chamber that as soon as the committee amendments were completed I would ask the Senate to take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow. In view of the promise I made I will ask the Senator to withhold his amendment in order that I may keep the promise.

Mr. BRATTON. Very well; in view of the circumstances I will not offer the amendment now.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I wish to offer an amendment to the pending bill and ask that it may lie on the table and be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

#### FUNDS OF AMERICAN RED CROSS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, on yesterday I made some comments on the floor and placed in the RECORD some data relative to the resources of the American National Red Cross. Last night the chairman of the American National Red Cross gave out a statement which was carried in some of the newspapers. I have here the statement as published in the Washington Post. I desire unanimous consent to have the statement incorporated in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

Mr. President, not taking the time to read the statement, I merely call attention to what it contains. The statement from Mr. Payne is to the effect that on November 30, 1930, the National Red Cross had an endowment fund permanently invested in the sum of \$11,253,000; that the organization had a disaster fund of \$5,000,000; that it had money set aside for the budget for the fiscal year of \$2,226,000; that it had \$1,734,000 set aside for what Mr. Payne terms "compelling obligations."

The National Red Cross has another fund, called a "safeguard fund," being a sum set aside against possible future disaster, in the amount of \$4,658,000.

The statement further shows that the national organization of the Red Cross has funds set aside for new building construction amounting to \$850,000. The last item mentioned is "restricted funds" in the amount of \$158,000. These items make a total of \$25,879,000.

Mr. President, this statement only has to do with the funds under the control of the national organization. The statement does not give any figures relative to the money taken in during the last annual roll call which took place in November, 1930, I believe. Those roll calls as a rule, so I am advised, bring to the treasury of the National Red Cross something like \$5,000,000. The statement does not embrace the amount of funds in the hands of thousands of local Red Cross chapters throughout the United States. I am advised unofficially that the total of these would be approximately \$7,500,000.

I submit this statement, and think it is fair to Mr. Payne to have his statement given the same publicity in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that was given to the statement I made on yesterday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement is as follows:

"The exact financial situation of the Red Cross (as of November 30, 1930) is this," Judge Payne said, plunging into the statistics. "It has an endowment fund and reserve permanently invested of \$11,253,000, the income of which it available for current use. It has a disaster relief fund of \$5,000,000, which has been appropriated for this present drought relief, of which \$1,000,000 has already been expended.

"After providing the budget of \$2,226,000 for work of this fiscal year, the Red Cross holds \$1,734,000 devoted to our compelling obligation for continuing service to the disabled former service men and women of the World War.

"It has a fund of \$850,000, supplemented by an appropriation by Congress, for the replacement of the war-time frame office building, the use of which must be discontinued in accordance with the Government's building program. There are restricted funds of \$158,000.

"There remains \$4,658,000 to safeguard all the other obligations to which the organization is committed, including immediate response to any other domestic disasters which may occur."

#### CONDITIONS IN THE PETROLEUM INDUSTRY

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, there was delivered this morning at the oil conference an address by Mr. Wirt Franklin, relating to conditions in the oil industry, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We have been called together to-day by the governors of the oil-producing States for the purpose of working out plans for prompt relief for the present dire distress in the petroleum industry. The situation is so serious as to merit the best thought of the leaders from the several States involved in the solution of our difficulties.

That we may understand the many problems with which we are confronted and the underlying causes of our existing depression, I deem it advisable to review briefly the history of the industry

for the past 10 years, the policies and purposes of those in authority, and the leaders of the industry, which have had considerable influence in bringing about, if they are not directly responsible for, the present conditions.

Let us go back to the year 1921, when conditions very similar to those of the present were prevalent in the petroleum industry, brought about at that time by vast importations of oil, chiefly from Mexico. Then there was under consideration in the Committee on Ways and Means, at that time under the chairmanship of Mr. Fordney, the question of giving protection to this industry by the levying of a tariff on imported crude oil. The committee on Ways and Means of the House had voted a tariff on oil in the then pending bill, and President Harding at that time, in a letter to Mr. Fordney requesting that a tariff on oil be omitted from the bill, for the first time declared the Government's policy of so-called conservation, which will be more fully analyzed and defined after I have traced its course and effect from that date to the present time. Congress failed to give oil the protection to which it was then entitled, but the Mexican Government shortly thereafter levied an export tax upon oil, which, to some extent at least, was an aid to the domestic industry. Thereafter the production of oil in Mexico gradually declined, while exploration and development work was begun in Venezuela, Colombia, and other South American countries.

In 1924, continuing the policy first enunciated by President Harding in 1921, President Coolidge appointed four members of his Cabinet as the Federal Oil Conservation Board, with the Secretary of the Interior as chairman. This board held hearings for the purpose of determining the extent of our petroleum reserves. The aid of the American Petroleum Institute was asked and given, and the country was alarmed at the reports emanating from the board and leaders of the petroleum industry that our petroleum reserves were in danger of exhaustion within a few years, and that even our safety as a nation was at stake. This was no new thing, as men prominent in the industry and others had for years from time to time made predictions of the early exhaustion of our oil resources. The rank and file of the producing branch of the business paid little heed to the hearings before the Federal Oil Conservation Board or to the warnings of those timid souls who prophesied the early demise of the petroleum industry in the United States. They did not believe these predictions, thought them harmless, and did not then foresee the results of their indifference. The major factors in the industry, many of whom held large concessions in Central and South America, participated in the hearings and aided in the dissemination to the people and the officials of the State and Federal Governments of information tending to convince the country of the early exhaustion of this irreplaceable natural resource, and to crystallize public sentiment in favor of hoarding our supplies, unused, for future generations. For years the press has been filled, to such an extent as to amount to propaganda, with the predictions and forebodings of these prophets of disaster. Whatever merit this so-called conservation policy had at its inception, subsequent developments have conclusively shown that the same was founded upon a false foundation of fact; that the use of the word "conservation" in connection with this policy was not in its true sense; that instead it meant reservation of our supplies in the ground, and the effect has been to mislead the people into believing that we were wasting our petroleum resources, which was far from the truth.

In 1928 it became apparent that there was an oversupply of oil being thrown upon the markets of the United States, due to increasing domestic production and increasing imports, chiefly from Venezuela. The American Petroleum Institute created a committee on world production and consumption, the avowed purpose of which was to bring about a curtailment of production in the United States and a curtailment of imports so as to bring production and imports in balance with consumption. Elaborate plans were formulated early in 1929, were submitted to the Federal Oil Conservation Board, and by that board referred to the Attorney General for the purpose of ascertaining whether the plan could be carried out without violation of the antitrust laws. The Attorney General could not promise immunity, and the work of the committee, covering the production of the country as a whole, was discontinued. In lieu thereof committees for curtailment of production were set to work in the various States, under the authority of State laws where same existed, and these State committees and subcommittees in the various districts within the States have succeeded to a remarkable degree in reducing the production of oil within the United States. As a corollary of this work and as a part of it, the plan contemplated the curtailment of production in the countries of South America, particularly Venezuela, which, had it succeeded, would have resulted in a reduction of imports of crude oil and refined products into the United States.

In the early part of 1929 Mr. M. L. Requa, reported at the time to be acting in behalf of President Hoover, called upon the governors of the several oil-producing States to enlist their aid in holding a conference of the petroleum industry and later called such a conference to meet at Colorado Springs, Colo., on June 10, 1929. This conference was attended by several of the governors and also by a large number of delegates from the various oil-producing States, representing all branches of the industry. The conference was opened by Mr. Requa with a statement of the aims thereof. Doctor Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior, again announced the conservation policies of the Federal Oil Conservation Board, and Dr. George Otis Smith, Director of the United States Geological Survey, among other things, stated, in substance, that the next 10 years would, in all probability, see the exhaustion of our

petroleum reserves to the point of endangering national defense. The doctrine of conservation was again expounded, and the delegates representing the various States were asked to form a compact among the States producing oil, which compact, when adopted and approved by Congress, would become the supreme law of the land; a commission would be appointed under the authority of the compact, with power to regulate and control the production of oil, to determine how much oil should be produced within the United States, and to allocate that production among the several oil-producing States.

When it became apparent that the real purpose of the meeting was not conservation in its real and accepted sense, but that the purpose was, by degrees and from time to time, to reduce the production of oil in the United States, and reserve our supplies in the ground for an indefinite period to come, and at the same time import our requirements in large part from foreign countries, the Colorado Springs conference adjourned without having accomplished anything whatever toward the consummation of the purpose for which it was called.

However, this conference had far-reaching effects. It revealed, in all its hideousness, to the rank and file of the petroleum industry the true intent and purposes of those who had been fostering and promoting the so-called conservation program, to shut in domestic production, to stop development, to reserve our oil supplies in the ground, to be developed and used after the foreign supplies have been exhausted, and to turn the markets for petroleum in the United States—approximately 70 per cent of the markets of the world—over to a few large companies engaged in exploiting the petroleum reserves of South America and in importing the production thereof into the United States. If there has been any doubt as to these intents and purposes in the past, all doubt must now be dispelled, since under date of January 6, 1931, Secretary Wilbur, after having received an invitation from the Governors of Oklahoma and Kansas to participate in this conference, gave to the Associated Press an interview declaring himself against a tariff on oil, and saying if he is correctly quoted by the press: "The chief result would be that the big companies, which now have many wells shut in and not in operation, would open them up, adding to the production. Overproduction is the basic ill of the industry."

It might be pertinent at this time to inquire what big companies have advised Secretary Wilbur in advance as to how they would defeat any beneficial results from a tariff on oil. The honorable Secretary also said: "In the future the country with the oil will dominate civilization. In it will be centered the wealth. America must conserve her supply. If we waste our oil reserves now, we will pay foreign countries through the nose for every barrel we import later. If I were the landlord of this country I would see that we used as much imported oil as possible, and let the other fellow waste his reserves."

The last-quoted sentence is a full and complete admission of the purposes of those promoting the so-called conservation movement—to turn over to four companies, chiefly engaged in importing oil, the entire markets of the United States, even though it might mean the destruction of one of the greatest industries in the United States, the impoverishment of a section of the United States and of the people thereof, almost if not quite one-third the area of the entire country, with a population of some 22,000,000 of people; and a civilization builded upon the oil industry.

In speaking thus does the honorable Secretary present to the public the views of the administration, or is he simply holding fast to ideas and convictions acquired some years ago under circumstances which might then have excused the views but which in the light of subsequent events are indeed archaic?

The conference at Colorado Springs having failed to bring forth a compact under which production could be controlled, the efforts, by voluntary cooperation and in some States under the provisions of State law, to curtail production, proceeded with remarkable success. Indeed, the figures are startling. We find that for the week ending August 24, 1929, the production of crude oil in the United States averaged 2,975,435 barrels per day, and for the week ending January 3, 1931, 2,082,100 barrels per day, or a curtailment in production in that period, brought about by the cooperation on the part of small and large producers alike throughout the country, of 893,335 barrels daily. We will produce in the United States this year approximately 100,000,000 barrels of oil less than we did in the year 1929; and while we have been reducing the domestic production 100,000,000 barrels the importers have, during 1930, brought into the United States and thrown upon our markets, duty free, more than 100,000,000 barrels of crude oil and refined products. In fact, the imports of gasoline during the first nine months of 1930 increased 125 per cent over the same period of 1929. The report of the committee on economics of the American Petroleum Institute at its Chicago meeting November 10, 1930, shows that each 5,000,000 barrels of gasoline imported would displace, for the six months ending March 31, 1931, 114,000 barrels daily of domestic production, while the report of the economics committee appointed by Secretary Wilbur to forecast the demand for petroleum products and ascertain and allocate oil production necessary to supply that demand for the six months ending March 31, 1931, shows that each barrel of gasoline imported displaces from the market 4 barrels of domestic crude. Crude oil, gasoline, and other refined products imported in the year 1930 have displaced from the market approximately 400,000 barrels daily of domestic production.

Since for a period of more than seven years there has been an intense propaganda fostered and promoted throughout the coun-

try, in the daily press and in many of the Nation's most prominent magazines, to convince the public of the early exhaustion of the petroleum reserves of the United States, it appears advisable at this point to outline briefly some of the former estimates of future oil production in the United States, and later to call attention to the vast petroleum reserves which we actually possess. It would also be pertinent to inquire what forces and organizations, corporate or individual, have promoted and paid for this propaganda and who are the beneficiaries thereof. An inquiry of this nature, properly and fairly conducted, would in all probability go far toward explaining the so-called conservation movement and why it has been urged for a period of years.

In referring to the former estimates of future recoverable petroleum reserves, let me state in advance that I do not wish to reflect whatever upon the good faith of the eminent engineers and other authorities making these estimates, but the recital of these estimates, in the light of subsequent information, will demonstrate how easily even the most eminent and learned can be mistaken on this subject, and will show further that perhaps the present advocates of the reservation of our petroleum reserves safely in the ground may be mistaken.

1908: David T. Day estimated minimum of 8,500,000,000 barrels; estimated a maximum of fifteen to twenty-two and one-half billion barrels; from 1908 to 1930, inclusive, United States has produced 11,442,447,000 barrels. All of Day's minimum, plus 33 per cent.

1914: Ralph Arnold estimated future production at 5,700,000,000 barrels; from 1914 to 1930, inclusive, United States produced 10,079,396,000 barrels. All of Arnold's estimate, plus over 80 per cent.

1915: United States Geological Survey estimated future production at 7,600,000,000 barrels; 1915 to 1930, inclusive, United States has produced 9,813,633,000 barrels. All of that estimate, plus 29 per cent.

1921: Certain petroleum geologists of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists estimated future production at 9,150,000,000 barrels; 1921 to 1930, inclusive, United States produced 7,719,222,000 barrels. Nearly 85 per cent in nine years.

1925: The committee of 11 appointed by the Federal Oil Conservation Board estimated future production from proven acreage on present methods 5,300,000,000 barrels; 1925 to 1930, inclusive, United States has produced from these properties and new pools 5,243,161,000, almost 99 per cent.

1930: In the year 1930 the United States, according to the best estimates available at the present time, produced 901,000,000 barrels, compared with 1,005,598,000 barrels in 1929.

1859 to 1930, inclusive: From beginning to date the United States has produced a total of 13,149,090,000 barrels.

The production curve has been on the upgrade for several years. The country could have produced this year, had there been any demand for it, several hundred million barrels in excess of that which was produced.

In 1913 the United States produced 248,446,000 barrels. In 1929 Oklahoma alone produced over 253,000,000 barrels, or more oil than the entire United States produced in so recent a year as 1913. Oklahoma produces a billion barrels of oil each four years; it is capable of producing a billion barrels each year if the demand called for such development. The same is true of Texas and California. It is highly probable that any one of the States of Oklahoma, Texas, and California can produce as much oil as the entire United States has produced to date. The oil resources of these States loom larger with each passing year as deeper drilling and exploration work is done. These States are getting the development at this time, and have for a number of years last past. Other States would leap forward accordingly if development to a like extent were done within their borders.

The production of the United States has been swinging upward from the discovery of oil to the present time—a period of 72 years. When we consider that the vast domain from the Canadian line to the Gulf of Mexico, lying immediately east of the Rocky Mountains, as well as the Pacific Coast States, is potential oil territory, practically undeveloped and unexplored at this time, it is apparent that the production curve will be on the upward trend for many years to come, and that when said curve starts downward, if that day ever comes, we will produce from our then known reserves of oil as much or more oil than has been produced prior to the day when the decline curve will start on its downward course.

What I have heretofore said has been applicable to reserves of oil to be produced from oil wells. Let us now consider the vast reserves contained in the oil shale deposits in the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Indiana, and other States. These deposits have been accurately surveyed, their oil content measured, and suffice it to say that in one deposit in Colorado alone the experts of the Government and the Colorado Bureau of Mines are agreed that there are 80,000,000,000 barrels of recoverable oil, should it ever become necessary to use the same.

We have in the coal deposits of the United States, which are more than 50 per cent of the coal deposits of the world, another great source of oil, so great indeed that it is difficult for the human mind to comprehend. By hydrogenation oil and its derivatives, including gasoline, can be successfully produced from coal. It is not at all improbable that the perfection of this process, using coal, or the discovery of some other form of power, may within a few years make our present oil reserves all but valueless.

Secretary Wilbur and other protagonists of so-called conservation continually speak of wasting our oil reserves, when, as a matter of fact, we are only using them without waste. It is cer-

tainly not fair to continually tell the public that the American petroleum industry is wasting our valuable oil reserves when the country is utilizing this great natural resource for the creation of new wealth within the country. This is the oil age. Let us utilize our oil while it is yet valuable, and before the discovery of some new form of power which may supersede oil for the generation of power. It is the utmost folly to continue on a program which perhaps was conceived with honesty of intentions, but which has outlived its usefulness and has become destructive in a superlative degree.

Imagine for a moment, if you will, that men of similar vision to those promoting the so-called oil-conservation policy of the present day had been directing the policies of the Government and the course of business from the foundation of our country until the present time; that, acknowledging our natural resources, the products of our mines, were irreplaceable, they should be preserved for use at some distant day; and that, instead of developing our natural resources and utilizing them, we had clung tenaciously to a policy of so-called conservation or reservation, then this great country of ours would now be, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, an undeveloped expanse of almost unbroken wilderness; the few inhabitants thereof a pastoral people; the great civilization which we have builded and the great industrial and commercial development which has taken place as yet undreamed of. What has made the United States the most enlightened, the most prosperous, the most advanced in all lines of endeavor of any nation in the world, has been the utilization of our natural resources. It would be just as logical to contend that we should import our iron ore, our lumber, our lead, coal, zinc, and other mineral products, reserving our supplies thereof in this country for some future national emergency, as it is to insist that we should import our requirements of oil. In fact, Russia is at this time willing to sell us all these things at a price less than our cost of production, and France, Great Britain, and other nations indebted to the United States would willingly pay their war debts by sending to us all of these products. How any patriotic American citizen can advocate such a policy is beyond comprehension.

We have heard a great deal and read more in the daily press and the oil journals concerning the overproduction of crude oil in the United States. As a matter of fact, during the last 12 years (1918 to 1929, inclusive) there has not been an overproduction in the United States but there has been an oversupply. During that period we have imported 950,000,000 barrels of crude oil. During that period we lacked 600,000,000 barrels of producing as much oil as we consumed, but during the same period we added to storage of crude oil in the United States 350,000,000 barrels, which, in addition to storage, as may be seen by these figures, was occasioned almost wholly by importing more oil into this country than we had any need of; so that it clearly appears that the great burden upon the petroleum industry of carrying in storage nearly 700,000,000 barrels of crude and refined products was not occasioned by overproduction in the United States but overimportation of foreign oils.

Now, let us inquire as to what effect the so-called conservation policy coupled with the proration and curtailment movement and the importation of oil and refined products has had upon the petroleum industry in the United States. The price of crude oil at the well has been reduced from time to time, until now it is being sold very much below the cost of production, except in isolated pools of new and large flush production, although, as before stated, we have reduced the production since the peak week in August, 1929, nearly 900,000 barrels daily, and the average price of crude oil throughout the country has during the same period been reduced more than one-third in price.

The case of Oklahoma is typical of all the rest. During the week ending August 24, 1929, the production of Oklahoma was 735,750 barrels per day, and for all of this production there was a ready market. Since then, by cooperative effort, and in line with the published suggestions of the Federal Oil Conservation Board and the requests of the major purchasers of oil in that State, the production has been reduced until in the week ending January 3, 1931, the State of Oklahoma actually produced only 448,900 barrels daily, or a reduction in the production during that period of 286,850 barrels daily. This has been accomplished in that State, in the face of the fact that the State could with ease supply sufficient oil to furnish the entire markets of the United States at the present time, and for a long time to come, from production already developed.

The proration movement and the curtailment of production in the various oil-producing States was inaugurated ostensibly for the purpose of stabilizing the petroleum industry, of preventing additions to storage, and balancing supply with demand. It has been a success only in so far as it has proved the ability of the industry to cooperate and accomplish curtailment of production. As production has been reduced imports have absorbed the market demand theretofore supplied by domestic oil, and instead of the price of oil being stabilized it has been steadily reduced until we are now almost upon a competitive basis, so far as prices are concerned, with cheap Venezuelan oil. One of two things must happen and soon. Either imports of crude oil and refined products must be curtailed, and the price thereof equalized with domestic products by the imposition of an adequate tariff, or the petroleum industry must be permanently placed upon a competing basis, so far as price is concerned, with the foreign oil. In fact, this is being gradually brought about, and it will not be many months before the destruction of the petroleum industry in the United States is complete. Already some 30,000 small wells in northeastern Oklahoma and southeastern Kansas have

lost their market, due to the inability of the Priarie Oil & Gas Co. to continue purchasing oil in the midcontinent field.

As stated by Mr. M. L. Requa, in opening the Colorado Springs conference, there are in the United States approximately 250,000 wells, with an average production of one barrel per day each. In addition to that, there are some 50,000 wells with an average production of five barrels per day each. In the aggregate, these wells have a settled production of over 500,000 barrels. They have been operated at a loss for more than three years. Many of them are being abandoned and plugged each week, under the benign influence of the present so-called conservation program. Ultimately these wells will all be lost, and in the name of conservation, 300,000 small wells, with a daily production of 500,000 barrels, and with recoverable reserves of oil of hundreds of millions of barrels, will have been destroyed. To save these wells would be true conservation, and it is within the power of the Federal Government to save them if it will. As they are being abandoned the oil-field laborer, with his family, living on the lease and operating these wells, has been thrown out of employment. He knows no other kind of work and under present conditions could not obtain employment if he did. There are literally thousands of these families at the present time dependent upon charity, and I can say, with feeling and in truth, that these men are native Americans, the kind that do not ask for charity, they do not wish to receive it, but who only claim the right by honest toil to support themselves and families.

Conservation has been tried as a remedy for the demoralization of the petroleum industry, and it has miserably failed, and will continue to fail as long as imported oil and refined products absorb the market demand as fast as domestic production is reduced. The domestic petroleum industry is being ruthlessly destroyed, in the name of conservation. The purchasing power of the oil-producing States has been reduced by hundreds of millions of dollars. The welfare of the petroleum industry is no longer of local significance. If one-third of the area of the United States, with a population of 22,000,000 of people, is impoverished to the point where the inhabitants can not purchase from the industrial and manufacturing sections of the country those things which a civilized and highly developed community need, there can be no industrial and commercial recovery in the United States for many years to come. The civilization of the Southwest has been builded upon oil and the allied and kindred industries dependent upon the petroleum industry. If this industry is destroyed, and the wealth and prosperity which it has created is transferred to some foreign country, this great civilization, until recent years prosperous and contented, will be destroyed, half of the people in the oil country must seek employment and outlets for their energies in other lines of industries already overcrowded, most of them will be compelled to leave that country and the wonderful cities of the Southwest, builded for the most part by the oil industry, will become depopulated, and their magnificent office buildings become the roosting place of bats and sparrows.

We are met to-day in an attempt to work out a remedy for the appalling conditions in the petroleum industry with which we are confronted. All other principal industries of the United States, when suffering under similar conditions to that now prevailing in the petroleum industry, have been granted relief and given protection from foreign domination and control by a protective tariff. The principle of a protective tariff for industries being injured or destroyed by cheap foreign imports has become the settled policy of this Government. Both the Democratic and Republican Parties, in their platforms in the year 1928, strongly indorsed such protection to American industries, and I would again remind you that Vice President CURTIS, in campaigning for the election of the present administration in a tour of the mid-continent field in that year, promised the industry tariff protection, and we all know that he was sincere in his declarations.

When it became apparent in the latter part of January, 1930, after a drastic cut in the price of crude oil, without any economic reason therefor, that those major companies engaged in importing crude oil and refined products in the United States had not given the full measure of cooperation promised by them, in curtailing their foreign production and imports commensurate with the curtailment of production in the United States, and after those same interests believed it was too late for the domestic producers to obtain relief from Congress in the then pending tariff bill, a mass meeting of the oil industry was held in Tulsa, Okla., on January 29, 1930. A large delegation of oil men arrived in Washington on February 3, 1930, and presented to President Hoover and to the Congress their plea for protection to this great basic industry. The tariff bill had then passed the House, had been reported by the Finance Committee to the floor of the Senate, and the time was too short within which to thoroughly acquaint the House and Senate with the true condition of the petroleum industry. Since then conditions have steadily grown worse and most of the things which were then told Congress would happen, if we were not given protection, have transpired. Congress did include in the tariff bill a provision directing the Tariff Commission to investigate and report to Congress the cost of Venezuelan oil and refined products delivered at Gulf and Atlantic ports, and the cost of domestic oil delivered at the same ports, and we are now expecting that report to be completed within a few days. Certainly by such a provision in the tariff bill it was the intention of Congress, should the facts warrant, to grant us relief and protection at the next ensuing session of Congress. The kindly reception accorded us at the last session, the generous support given in such a short time

by Congress, is assurance that when the Members realize the true facts in connection with this question relief and protection will be granted.

Congress has recently had under consideration relief bills, under which it is proposed to give relief in various sections of the country to the farmers and others. In the oil-producing States, as is generally known, the farmers and landowners own one-eighth royalty in all the oil and gas produced. The producing oil companies hold under lease, for future prospecting, millions of acres in all the oil-producing States, on which a rental, usually \$1 per acre, is being paid in addition to the bonus or purchase price of the leases themselves, from which the farmers, in thousands of instances, have been able to pay off their mortgages and improve their farms, while the annual rental, during recent years of crop failures and low prices for farm products, has paid the taxes on their farms and in addition helped to support the farmers and their families. But with prevalent conditions in the petroleum industry, those engaged in the producing branch of the business, having had their resources and income severely reduced, are unable to continue paying these rentals, are surrendering the leases, and the farmers are being deprived of millions of dollars of income heretofore enjoyed by them. Literally thousands of men, formerly employed in and near the oil fields, are now idle, and the community funds raised in the adjacent cities and towns are being called upon to assist them. In addition, the oil men themselves, in some districts where they are still able to raise the money, are contributing funds and, through committees, administering relief to the families of idle oil-field employees. How much better it would be for Congress to bring relief to the petroleum industry through a measure imposing a tariff on imported crude oil and refined products, which would bring revenue into the Federal Treasury, instead of by inaction on this measure making it necessary to appropriate millions from the Treasury for relief.

It was at one time argued by those importing crude oil into this country that there should be no tariff or other limitation on imports because the crude oil was brought to the United States and gave employment to American capital and labor. This is no longer true. The Royal Dutch Shell has constructed and has had in operation for several years a refinery at Curacao, a Dutch island off the coast of Venezuela, the capacity of which has been increased in the last year to 250,000 barrels per day, while the Pan-American Co., subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, has a refinery on the island of Aruba (also a Dutch island off the coast of Venezuela) of 110,000 barrels daily capacity. In addition to these there are two smaller plants with an aggregate capacity of more than 30,000 barrels per day. Operating on cheap oil produced on the mainland, transported at a negligible cost to the refineries, and with transportation in tankers for the refined products from these huge refineries, the American petroleum industry is no longer able to compete in the world markets with them. He who can not visualize within the next few years the complete loss of our export market has little imagination, indeed.

The American companies now exporting oil to Europe will continue to export the same for some years to come due to the fact that they have their own controlled outlets. It is from these refineries that the gasoline and other refined products come which absorb by leaps and bounds the market formerly supplied by Pennsylvania, New York, West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, California, and the great mid-continent field and which has made necessary the proration program and the vast curtailment in the production of the United States.

The Department of Commerce maintains in the capitals and most of the principal cities of the world commercial attachés for the purpose of advancing the commercial interest of the United States, and a large part of their duties is in assisting to secure additional market outlets for petroleum products produced and refined in the United States. At the same time Secretary Wilbur, of the Interior Department and chairman of the Federal Oil Conservation Board, is devoting his energies to reducing domestic production and encouraging these other countries to send their petroleum products to the markets of the United States.

Is the oil industry of this country to continue in the curtailment of production in an ever-increasing degree while the output of Venezuela and other South American countries continues to absorb the domestic market without paying one cent of taxation to support the Government of the United States, the States, or the legal subdivisions thereof, whereas the domestic oil industry is the most heavily taxed of any industry in the United States, paying first in most States a gross production tax of 3 or 4 per cent of all the oil and gas produced; a State income tax, a Federal income tax, an ad valorem tax, a capital-stock tax, and other taxes too numerous to mention.

But those engaged in importing oil will contend that there should be no tariff on imports, because our exports of petroleum are greater in value than our imports. If this argument is sound and of compelling force, then Congress should, without delay, repeal the tariff bill in its entirety, for on examination we find that on the following products, to wit, iron and steel, semimanufactured; steel-mill products; iron and steel, advanced manufacture; electrical machinery; industrial machinery; office appliances and printing machinery; automobiles and other vehicles; animal oils and fats; manufactured cotton; manufactures of wood; pigments, paints, and varnishes; soaps and toilet preparations; photographic goods; scientific and professional instruments, and musical instruments, the imports during the calendar year 1929 were \$172,577,000, while the exports from the United States of the same products totaled \$1,725,111,000.

During the same year the foreign value of imported crude petroleum and refined products was \$140,965,000, duty free, while the exports of the same products totaled, in American value, \$531,173,000. Imports of petroleum, both crude and refined, in 1929, amounted to approximately 110,000,000 barrels (about 10 per cent in barrels of the domestic production), while in 1930 it is estimated that the total number of barrels of imports of both crude and refined products will be slightly in excess of 100,000,000 barrels, and the estimated production of crude oil in the United States for the year 1930 slightly in excess of 900,000,000 barrels. The imports of crude oil in 1930 have been reduced, as compared with the year 1929, but the imports of gasoline and other refined products have been so greatly increased as to displace a much greater amount of domestic crude from the market than was the case in the year 1929.

Secretary Wilbur in his recent release to the Associated Press contended that since the imports were only about 10 per cent of our domestic crude production, they were a negligible factor. But it is too well recognized as sound economics to require more than the mere statement thereof that a 10 per cent surplus of any commodity thrown on the market will demoralize completely the price structure of the whole supply, and this is what has occurred in the petroleum industry. A 10 per cent or even a 5 per cent surplus production of cotton, wheat, corn, or of any manufactured or industrial commodity has always brought about widespread depression and demoralization in the price structure of the commodity of which there is an oversupply on the market. Especially is this true in the case of oil and refined products when those engaged in producing and refining the same in Venezuela and other South American countries are able at will to increase the imports in any amount, so that the threat of the same continually hangs over the domestic market.

At the time of the last reduction in the price of crude oil in the mid-continent field, which reduction amounted to more than 25 per cent in the then average price, those companies posting the reduced price accompanied the same with the statement that it was made necessary because of competition. Certainly it was not the competition of domestic production, because at the time of the posting of this crude price reduction the cooperative movement to curtail production had reduced the same nearly 600,000 barrels per day in the United States; the companies posting the reduced prices for crude oil, after having promised full cooperation in the proration program, betrayed producers by withdrawing from storage 26,000,000 barrels of oil in the year 1930.

In recent months imported gasoline has been sold in tanker lots in Atlantic seaports as low as 4 cents per gallon. Certainly it must have been the competition of this imported gasoline that made necessary the reduction in price of the domestic product. This reduction in the price of crude oil has followed throughout the United States by an average reduction in the wholesale price of gasoline (which was not passed on to the consumer) of 2 cents per gallon. Granting, for the sake of argument, that the difference in the values of our imports and exports of petroleum products, and the favorable trade balance of \$390,000,000 created thereby was all profit, even though that profit went to only four or five huge corporations, and keeping in mind that within the last year the price of 36-gravity mid-continent crude has been reduced more than one-third (50 cents per barrel), how long would it take at 50 cents per barrel, with a daily consumption in the United States at the present time of upward of 2,500,000 barrels of crude oil, to entirely account for said \$390,000,000 favorable trade balance from crude-oil production alone? And let us also ask how long it would take, at 2 cents a gallon (the amount of reduction in the wholesale price of gasoline in recent months) with a daily consumption of 1,250,000 barrels of gasoline, to account a second time for said \$390,000,000 of favorable trade balance?

While the argument is made that our exports of petroleum products exceed our imports thereof, we find, upon an analysis of the figures, that, taking into consideration the exports from the Pacific coast, to which there are no imports, or, if any, only a negligible amount, that there are more barrels of petroleum products imported to the Gulf and Atlantic ports than are exported from the same ports.

Again it is stated that there should be no tariff on imports of petroleum products because it would be detrimental to the interests of the consumers, the buyers of gasoline; that the consumers so far outnumber the producers and refiners and those employed in the petroleum industry that their interests are paramount. However, there seems to be little relation between the price of crude oil to the producer in the United States and the price of gasoline and lubricating oils to the consumer. This can be illustrated briefly by referring to the fact that in February, 1926, in 52 representative cities throughout the United States, the average price of gasoline at the filling station, exclusive of tax, was 18.09 cents per gallon, while the average price of crude oil of 36 gravity Baumé during February, 1926, in Oklahoma and Kansas was \$2.04 per barrel. The average recovery of gasoline by the refining methods then in use was 35 per cent, or 14.70 gallons per barrel. In 1929 the average price of gasoline at the filling stations in the same cities, exclusive of tax, was 18.39 cents per gallon, while the price of crude oil of 36 gravity Baumé in Kansas and Oklahoma was \$1.20, and the recovery of gasoline by improved refining methods had increased to 46 per cent, or 19.32 gallons of gasoline for each barrel of oil. The same relative price schedules obtained throughout the years 1926 and 1929. The price of gasoline to the consumer has not fluctuated in proportion to the price of crude oil.

Cheap imported fuel oil has caused the price of the domestic fuel oil in the refining centers of the mid-continent field to fall at times below 50 cents per barrel, thus bringing about a very wasteful utilization of this oil, which might better be saved for higher uses than fuel. This cheap fuel oil, coming into competition with coal, has brought serious distress to the coal industry throughout the country, which industry has been compelled to discharge from employment during the time this condition has prevailed not less than 50,000 American laborers employed in the mines and in the transportation of coal. The unemployment problem, now receiving such diligent consideration by the administration, might be greatly reduced by shutting out imports of cheap fuel oil, allowing the use of coal in many industrial and manufacturing centers, and thus bringing about a reemployment of thousands of miners who are now idle.

If the present program of so-called conservation is continued, and results in the shutting down of producing wells, and the cessation of development and exploration work, the known oil reserves of the United States will become practically valueless. The present owners, unable to hold the same without receiving any income therefrom, will be compelled to sell them in a market demoralized because of this program. The purchasers who would be willing to buy under these conditions would be the same corporations who control and monopolize the production and marketing of oil throughout the world, outside of the United States. It is acknowledged that there is a world monopoly on oil, outside of this country. The markets of the United States are approximately 70 per cent of the markets of the world for petroleum products. If it is desirable that monopoly shall securely fasten its tentacles upon the petroleum industry of the United States with the same grip it holds upon the remainder of the world, and if it is desirable that the consumers of the United States should ultimately pay the same price for gasoline and other petroleum products that are charged in Europe and other foreign countries, then the so-called program of conservation should be continued, even though it bring utter ruin in its wake to one-fifth of the population of the United States directly and indirectly and in a lesser degree to the entire country; even though it shall cause an increase in ad valorem taxes in the oil-producing States, to make up for the taxes lost from the gross-production tax on oil and gas; even though its effect on general business, banking, and agriculture, through destruction of consuming power, shall be most serious; even though 20,000 oil producers, individuals, partnerships, and large and small corporations shall be put out of business, and their 800,000 employees and their families compelled to look for work in other lines; and even though the advocates of this policy, in reserving the petroleum resources of the United States for future generations, shall, after viewing the havoc wrought by their program, have a feeling of righteous accomplishment.

I have never contended that a tariff on oil is a panacea for all the ills of the industry. Were imports entirely eliminated, we must still proceed with a sane, orderly program of development and operation of our oil fields, and by cooperation balance supply with demand as we have so ably demonstrated we can do—as we have done in the past two years.

I would like to say in closing that we should not be discouraged. We have won much support. The whole petroleum industry, the business and commercial interests, the farmers and the landowners of the oil-producing States now present a solid front in demanding immediate relief, and are militantly supporting the program for the exclusion of a foreign oil from the domestic markets, either through the instrumentality of a protective tariff, or if the political exigencies prevent that form of remedy, then by an embargo for a period of years forbidding any importation of oil products whatever.

The directors of the American Petroleum Institute, at its meeting in Chicago, November 10, adopted by a majority vote, a resolution indorsing in principle, a tariff on the importation of crude oil and refined products into the United States. On December 5, at the annual meeting of the directors of the General Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association, which association embraces the six States of Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Texas, Louisiana, and Arkansas, and contains in its membership representatives of most of the producing, refining, and marketing interests engaged in business in that district, adopted with only one dissenting vote, a resolution strongly demanding a tariff on oil and refined products, and directing the officers of the association to do everything in their power to secure that form of relief for the industry. The Rocky Mountain Oil and Gas Association took similar action. All the local oil and gas associations throughout the country have done likewise. The Independent Petroleum Association of America, with membership in every oil-producing State of the Union, is a unit in demanding tariff relief. The chambers of commerce of most of the cities and towns in the oil States have likewise demanded a tariff on oil. A number of State legislatures, which have been in session since the depression in the oil industry has become acute, have memorialized Congress for this relief, the latest one to take such action being the Legislature of California, early this week. Various farm organizations have taken a decided stand in favor of a tariff on oil.

With this united and determined support, I feel that Congress and the administration should and will give heed to our prayers and grant us that protection which only they can grant, and thus prevent our complete demoralization and ruin. The historical and statistical facts justify, the social and economic conditions demand this relief. Certainly, with all this before them, our Government can find a way.

## TRENDS IN TRANSPORTATION—ARTICLE FROM YALE DAILY NEWS

Mr. GOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Yale Daily News of January 12, 1931, entitled "Future Trends in American Transportation." It reflects the growth of our country and then convincingly explains the effect of such growth upon the ever-advancing industrial life of our people. It points the way to economic stability in the days to come and coordination of the many conflicting interests in the ever-changing present. It is analytical, illuminating, and helpful. It should be read by everyone who is studying and trying to solve this intricate problem of national and international transportation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Yale Daily News, January 12, 1931]

## FUTURE TRENDS IN AMERICAN TRANSPORTATION

One hundred years ago American railways entered the transportation field, playing but a small part at first, but eventually performing substantially all of the transportation required because all other agencies of transportation were unable to compete with them in either rates or services. This growth and expansion through the years brought into immediate contact portions of the country which formerly had been far apart, and this low cost of transportation which they provided enabled the industry of America to do business profitably and economically over the vast areas of the United States. Thus the rise of America to the industrial supremacy of the world parallels the development of its low-cost rail transportation.

One result, however, of America's growth both in population and industry has been to center enormous populations around the larger cities, and the creation of these larger centers has tended to offset the very thing the railroads accomplished, namely, transportation at low cost.

Development of the larger centers of population made necessary a secondary transportation system—a system for distribution from the railroad to the consumer. But the growth of this secondary system has gone beyond the stage of merely supplementing rail transportation and has become, through its transition stages, an actual and substantial competitor of the rail system. In other words, the growth of the motor industry in America has been accompanied by the development of a system of highways for the use of the automobile, which have also become highways for commerce in competition with the railroad.

American ingenuity has endeavored to avoid the high costs of rail transportation in congested areas by using this new form of transportation, but at only slightly lower cost of transportation to the consumer.

If these two forms of transportation should continue to develop separately, each independent and regardless of the other, they will be an impediment rather than a help to America's industrial growth. If they grow supplementary to each other, the progress of America over the next few decades will be steadily forward. Moreover, by supplementing each other they can benefit each other as well as benefit themselves.

Motor transportation has the advantage of the cheaper terminal costs; rail transportation has the advantage of the cheaper costs for the haul. It is financially and physically impossible for the railways to extend to the larger areas the same economy of terminal service as they have been able in the past to give to the smaller communities. It is impossible for the motor agencies with their individual units, to give the economy in distance transportation which the railways can provide through their mass movements in train loads.

The basis of sound, economic coordination is, therefore, obvious: If the railways meet the issue they will give to the motors their terminal delivery. If the motors meet the issue they will give to the railways their long haul. Acting together they will be able to give to the public a cheaper transportation than it is now getting, without lessening the return to either. The railways not only will have to readjust, but are in the process at this time of readjusting their methods and practices, so as to be able to coordinate with the motor industry. The motor industry itself is also showing its willingness to adjust its methods and practices to coordinate with rail transportation.

The primary reason for coordination of these two transportation agencies is the cost of distribution, principally in the larger terminal areas, where the terminal delivery costs are greater than the cost of the rail haul itself.

In the larger centers the rail terminals are in effect moving farther and farther away from the consumers of transportation, and as the larger centers grow and business hunts for less expensive locations of manufacture, the costs from the rail head to the industry increases as handling and rehandling become necessary. The problem of the railways and motors in the terminal therefore is so coordinate one with the other, as to eliminate rehandling and save time.

This problem is already on its way to solution in some of the larger centers through delivery by the rail carrier of freight ready for motor haul to final destination, either by transferring it in

containers direct to motor tractors, or by transporting motor bodies already loaded.

In the next few years merchandise freight, less-than-carload freight, and, to some extent, a considerable portion of carload freight will move direct from consignee to consignor practically without rehandling. It will move either in truck body or container direct from the plant of the manufacturer to the railway for transport and at the destination end of the rail haul it will move direct from the railway to the door of the receiver. It will also move at lesser rail costs but at greater potential earnings, as far as the railway is concerned; at lesser truck costs but at greater potential earnings, as far as the trucker is concerned; at lesser total transportation costs, as far as both truck and railway are concerned; and at lower costs for packing, stowing, and transportation, as far as consignee and consignor are concerned.

The accomplishment of this end needs no restrictive regulation—to the embarrassment of either the railway or the motor. What it requires is the cooperation of the public with both industries so that they may be able jointly to effect a coordinated system which will be of vast public benefit.

Similar developments are under way with respect to the larger manufactured articles as distinguished from merchandise freight. The railways can and will readjust their methods of transportation to suit the changed requirements of industry, at a profitable return to themselves as well as with advantage to industry itself.

The railroad industry can bring back to itself the transportation of the larger and heavier commodities which over the last decade have tended to leave them. For instance, in the automobile trade there has been a gradual tendency to hunt other forms of transportation instead of the railways for the delivery of automobiles. By redesigning equipment suitable to the evolution of this business and with the cooperation of the industry itself, the railways can provide a means of delivering this traffic which has been lost, in quicker time, in better shape, and at lesser cost without reducing the return to themselves.

In dealing with the low-grade commodities, the problem of the railways generally parallels what it was in the past, namely, mass production; bigger cars and bigger trains, with the producers and the carriers working together for the more economical handling and the better marketing of the production.

In passenger transportation the bus, properly coordinated with rail transportation will never seriously invade the railway field. Regulated to the advantage of the bus itself and supplanting intraurban and interurban service as it does, it can be made a very necessary supplementary part of rail transportation.

Along all these lines of development the practical success which the railways can achieve is indicated by what has already been done and is now under way on the Pennsylvania Railroad.

The only restrictions that can possibly impede the future progress of the railways in American transportation are political and not economic; restrictions as to car size and train size, and the survival of certain legislative restrictions based on suspicions of the past, which bar the railways from engaging in waterway transportation and prevent them from applying to rail-waterway transportation the advantages of coordinated service which they are applying to rail-motor transportation.

In conclusion, it may be pointed out that railroad development in this country can be divided generally into three periods:

1. The period of railroad building and expansion of the physical plant.
2. The period of intensive internal development of the efficiency of that plant.
3. The period of expansion into new forms of transportation required by the growth and progress of business, and the necessity for the most economical distribution.

American railways are entering now upon the third stage. Their success will depend, in this period, as in each of the other periods, on their ability to produce economically the transportation required in whatever form that service is performed.

There is no basis whatsoever for pessimism in respect of the future of the railroads. New forms of transportation and the possibilities of coordinating them with the railroads offer a field of railroad expansion which should not only meet the modern needs of business in cutting distribution costs, but should also be reflected in more stable and satisfactory returns upon the capital invested in all forms of transportation.

## MR. RASKOB AND THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at—

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. GLENN. Late yesterday afternoon I offered for printing in the RECORD an article by Mr. Frank Kent regarding Mr. Raskob. The minority leader of the Senate, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], made inquiry of me as to whether the letter of Mr. Raskob, to which the Kent article is a reply, had been printed in the RECORD. I said I did not know, whereupon the Senator from Arkansas objected, as I thought properly—at least I found no fault with him for so doing.

I now offer as a part of my remarks and ask that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "The Prize Paradox," printed in the Baltimore Sun of January 6, 1931, signed by Mr. Kent, Mr. Raskob's reply thereto entitled "Raskob Denies Democratic Party His Own," the article covering the reply being written by Mr. J. F. Essary and published in the Baltimore Sun of January 13, and a third article entitled "A Reply to Mr. Raskob," published in the Baltimore Sun under date of January 14, and signed by Frank R. Kent. These articles, as I understand, constitute the entire series on the subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The articles referred to are as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of January 6, 1931]

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—THE PRIZE PARADOX

By Frank R. Kent

WASHINGTON, January 5.—Converts to a cause are always more zealous than those born in the faith. Perhaps that is one reason for the extraordinary enthusiasm that now characterizes the democracy of Mr. John J. Raskob, chairman of the national committee. In the past two years there have been various demonstrations of Mr. Raskob's devotion to his present party as evinced by his financial support. The extent to which he has become the actual owner of the party machinery, which for all practical purposes is the party, was never as completely revealed, however, as on last Friday when Mr. Gerard, treasurer of the committee, filed his annual report with the House of Representatives.

It was then made plain that there just isn't anything else to the party organization except Mr. Raskob. He has taken over all its liabilities, assumed all its debts and is paying out of his own pocket all its running expenses, far heavier now than ever before. He not only has reduced the party deficit, which was nearly a million dollars, to \$628,000, but has assumed responsibility for the \$628,000. The party now owes Mr. Raskob personally nearly a quarter of a million dollars. The receipts of the committee for the year were \$619,000, its expenditures \$612,000. Of the money received all save \$15,000 in small contributions came through Mr. Raskob.

It was Mr. Raskob who expanded the Washington headquarters, put Mr. Shouse in charge and is paying all operating expenses, including \$27,000 a year to Mr. Shouse's brother-in-law, Mr. Waller B. Hunt, who is in charge of "organization," and \$21,000 a year to Mr. Charles Michelson, whose 2-year publicity campaign has marked a new development in politics. Also, he pays Mrs. Nellie Ross \$8,500, presumably for work among women. Further, Mr. Raskob, it seems, sent personal contributions to various Democratic senatorial and congressional candidates in the last campaign. Add up all these items and the Raskob ownership of the party seems pretty well established. Never in the 135 years of its history has it been so heavily obligated to a single individual. Never has any party been so deeply in debt to one man. The thing is unprecedented. It is real news. It is amazing that not more has been made of it. In the past when the Democratic Party had a note in bank it was indorsed by sometimes as many as 30 or more names. Now there is but one name on the back.

There are several views of the Raskob ownership. One is that Mr. Raskob is a grand little guy who became chairman to help his friend Mr. Smith, but once in, instead of quitting as he might have done, is gallantly playing the game out in a grand manner; that he has no personal ends to serve, and party people generally should rejoice over an angel of such enormous wealth and unprecedented liberality. It is a great piece of luck. He has made the party a vibrant instrument, pulled it out of the financial swamp, made it an effective fighting force. He is entitled to gratitude and appreciation.

Another view is that there is nothing in Mr. Raskob's record to show that he is either a sucker who throws money recklessly around or a Democrat through principle, preference, or conviction. On the contrary, in money matters Mr. Raskob is a typically hard-boiled multimillionaire. As far as his Democracy is concerned, he became a Democrat solely because of the Smith candidacy. Prior to 1928 he consistently contributed to and voted for the Republican candidates, including Coolidge, Harding and Hughes. To think that his present extraordinary financial support of the Democratic Party is wholly disinterested and unselfish is not reasonable.

Men like Mr. Raskob do not operate that way. The fact is the completeness with which he finances the party means that he controls—or can when he wants—its publicity and fixes its direction. It means that no one unacceptable to him personally and out of tune with his ideas can be nominated in 1932. It means that if the party wins the Presidency next time it will be Raskob's money that made it possible and he will be entitled to anything he wants under the administration. And the answer to that is, Why not? Certainly he will have paid for it. And, anyhow, there is nothing quite as absurd as these politicians who criticize Mr. Raskob for not being "disinterested and unselfish." A disinterested and unselfish politician! Who ever heard of such a thing? It would be the prize paradox.

[From the Baltimore Sun of January 13, 1931]

RASKOB DENIES DEMOCRATIC PARTY IS OWNED—NATIONAL CHAIRMAN, IN OPEN LETTER, REPLIES TO FRANK R. KENT—SAYS SMITH FRIENDS CUT DEBT BY MILLION—CHARGES CERTAIN REPUBLICANS SEEK TO FOMENT RELIGIOUS HATRED

By J. F. Essary

WASHINGTON, January 12.—John J. Raskob, Democratic national chairman, openly charged to-night that a "strong group in the Republican National Committee has been fomenting religious and class hatreds during the past two years and prostituting the Republican Party to gain ballots from a misinformed, abused, and misguided public."

This charge was made in replying to an article by Frank R. Kent in the Sun of January 6, in which Mr. Kent had referred to the unprecedented financial assistance given the Democratic national organization by Mr. Raskob.

Mr. Raskob's letter as addressed to Mr. Kent and as issued publicly by the Democratic National Committee is as follows:

"My attention has been called to an article written by you, published on January 6. It is difficult to understand why a man of your standing should join that small group of writers whose articles generally have little regard for the truth and are written in sensational style for consumption of a gullible public. Ordinarily, real men refuse to dignify articles and writers of this type with the slightest recognition, but when you liken the Democratic Party to a common harlot that can be bought and sold, used and abused at will, you tramp on the toes of millions of Democrats who are proud of their heritage, glory in the traditions of their party, and resent your insults.

"You charge that I have taken over all the liabilities of the Democratic Party, assumed all its debts; that I am the only indorser on its notes; that I put Mr. Shouse in charge and am paying all operating expenses, including several large salaries, and have made great reduction in the party debt—in short, that I have bought and paid for the party.

#### DENIES ALL STATEMENTS

"None of these statements is true. I am one of a group of men indorsing the only committee note outstanding. I have assumed none of the liabilities and none of the debts of the committee. Mr. Shouse was unknown to me previous to the 1928 campaign and was selected as chairman of the executive committee of the Democratic National Committee by the members of that committee after long and careful consideration of several important names and after consulting with other strong party leaders.

"He is in complete charge of and responsible for work assigned to him, has selected and employed every one of his own staff (including Mr. Hunt, whom you designate as his brother-in-law, but who, in fact, is not related to him in anyway), without recommendation from me; has never been interfered with by me, but has shaped his policies and conducted his work most successfully through working in close communion and harmony with the members of the Democratic National Committee, and particularly with Democratic Senators and Representatives, who are easily accessible in Washington.

#### SMITH'S FRIENDS CUT DEBT

"The million dollars' reduction in the party debt was made not by me, but by close friends and associates of Governor Smith, who felt great responsibility for a large part of our deficit and met it. I am loaning money to the national committee, which will be repaid. As a result of the party's defeat in 1928 and the severe financial depression of the past 15 months it has been difficult to raise money to carry on our work. My faith and confidence in the fundamental liberal principles of the Democratic Party gave me a great sense of security in the party's virility and the repayment of necessary loans.

"The recent 1930 elections fully justify my faith, and the party is now bigger, stronger, and better organized nationally than ever. Plans are under way for a nation-wide fund-raising campaign to meet our debts and provide money to continue the great work the national organization is now doing.

#### DENIES HE WAS REPUBLICAN

"Your article infers that I was a Republican and states that I voted for Coolidge, Harding, and Hughes, and became a Democrat solely because of the Smith candidacy. None of the above is true, although it has been used by the Republicans as political propaganda in every malicious way possible and in spite of my denials. The facts are that my grandfather, father, and whole family were Democrats, and I lived with them until 27 years of age, when I married into a family that have been Democrats always, having settled in Maryland in 1634 and lived there ever since.

"I disapproved of the party's attitude on silver in 1896, and in consequence, although generally voting the Democratic ticket, have always been an independent in politics until I affiliated with the Democratic Party. I have never affiliated with the Republican Party, never voted or took part in its primaries, did vote for a Republican President, and belong to the Union League, a social club, in Philadelphia, the charter of which provides that a member must believe in our republican form of government. It does not provide a member must be a Republican.

"When I was elected a member, the membership committee were told I voted for President Wilson, and my resignation has not been requested by reason of being chairman of the Democratic

National Committee or otherwise. Furthermore, a substantial number of its membership voted for Hon. Alfred E. Smith for President in 1928, and an even greater number voted for Mr. Hemphill for Governor of Pennsylvania last November.

#### REFERS TO HOOVER'S REPORTED SHIFT

"There is no apology needed for any man whose convictions are changed on any subject. Gossip has it that Mr. Hoover was formerly a Democrat. It was his right to change his opinion and his politics, but when your article infers that I was a Republican and changed to the Democratic Party because of my religion and because Alfred E. Smith is a Roman Catholic, you are merely joining that strong group in the Republican National Committee that have been fomenting religious and class hatreds during the past two years and prostituting the Republican Party to gain ballots from a misinformed, abused, and misguided public.

"Seeds of hatred sown wildly in times of depression and poverty fall on soil made very fertile for weedy growth by hunger and suffering in times like these. If the consequences thereof could be visited on those guilty of sowing the seed, no one would complain. But it is the poor and innocent public, ignorant of the facts, that must suffer the consequences.

"Because of an appreciation of its responsibility the Democratic National Committee has conducted clean campaigns devoid of nefarious practices, despite the artifices of its adversaries. Shame on the man who, in such circumstances, masquerading as a member of the party, should pervert his talents to such improper usages and make himself part and parcel of the campaign of bigotry and intolerance in which the Republican Party is engaged.

"Never in its history has our country had greater need for pure, unselfish, patriotic service than now. My lack of education in political matters makes politics difficult and unattractive to me. However, when drafted into service through the chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee, I responded to the call confident in the belief that it is only through the Democratic Party that we can quickly return to the liberal form of government established by the founders of our Government when they adopted the Constitution of the United States. I accepted my position with the distinct understanding that I desired no public office and would consider unfair any attempt to draft me farther into public service.

"The Democratic Party is not and will not be controlled by any man or small group of men. Nominations for President and Vice President will be made by the Democratic National Convention and not dictated by any clique. When this great party bows to the control of one man or small group of men as does the Republican Party, it will cease to be Democratic, will cease to exist, and will not have me, a true liberal in every sense of the word, as its national chairman.

#### LOOKS TO 1932 CAMPAIGN

"Unselfish, patriotic service to one's country can easily be viewed by selfish, suspicious people as a 'prize paradox,' but, thank God, the country is overflowing with unselfish, patriotic citizens who are only awaiting the 1932 national elections to follow a leader carrying their banner.

"As your article was published on the front page of the Baltimore Sun of January 6, I am giving this letter to the press for the information of the people of the country.

"Very truly yours,

"(Signed) JOHN J. RASKOB,  
"Chairman Democratic National Committee."

[From the Baltimore Sun of January 14, 1931]

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—A REPLY TO MR. RASKOB

By Frank R. Kent

WASHINGTON, January 13.

DEAR MR. RASKOB: Your letter of January 12, in which you reply to an article of mine in the Sun asserting that you had underwritten the very heavy expenses of the Democratic headquarters in Washington, had assumed all the party liabilities, reduced the million-dollar debt, personally loaned the party a quarter of a million dollars, and owned the committee machinery, because you had paid for it, was received this morning. You are entitled to the courtesy of a reply.

Aside from the personal abuse of myself and a number of calculated false statements, your letter seems to me evasive, deceitful, and disingenuous, deliberately designed to obscure the facts, not to clarify them. I can quite understand that neither you nor Mr. Shouse nor the rest of your committee employees could sit still under my article. All I did was to take the facts and figures revealed by Mr. Gerard's report to the House of Representatives, together with other generally known facts about your party financing, and print them in a logical sequence. But it so happened that no one had done this before, and when it appeared in print the picture was not a pretty one. It scared you and it scared your pay-roll boys. After the clippings from all parts of the country in which the article was reprinted began to come in your publicity department felt the thing had to be answered.

Democrats generally had not exactly realized the degree of your party ownership, and the reaction when they did was distinctly unfavorable. So after six days I got a letter. It would have been shrewder for you to have answered it immediately, thus

avoiding that week during which the facts sank in and thus making your indignation seem a little less spurious. Because you know and I know you are not really indignant; you are just a breast-beating amateur in politics who has had the covers pulled off him.

Now, then, in view of your excited denunciation of me as one having little regard for the truth and the vehemence of your general denials, I herewith repeat the main statements I made in the Baltimore Sun on January 6.

I assert that so far as the Democratic Party has liabilities and debts you have taken them over. There may be other indorsers on the note, but your name heads the list and you are the chief responsible person and so recognized. You have done all the financing and it is you who have reduced the \$1,000,000 debt to approximately \$600,000. Further, I assert that you selected Mr. Shouse as executive chairman, arranged for the expanded headquarters in Washington, for the high-priced publicity department, and underwrote for a period of three years the unprecedented expenses of the work here.

I further assert that the record shows the Democratic Party to-day personally owes you for money loaned a quarter of a million dollars. I further assert that it owes you more every month, not less, and that in the last campaign the record shows nine-tenths of all money contributed came from you.

I further assert that in the history of this country no political party was ever under such financial obligations to any individual as the Democratic Party is to-day under to you. You brought the party out of bankruptcy, put it through the receivership, stood it on its financial obligations to its financial feet, and then clapped a first mortgage on it. You are the first-mortgage holder.

That's the story as I wrote it, and that's the story as I repeat it. You can quibble as much about details as you please and you can dwell upon your unselfishness and purity and upon my wickedness and unregeneracy as often as your press department can write your letters, but it is in every essential fact a true story, which well you know. So does every other clear-headed man. I did not in my article intimate that in what you had done financially for the Democratic Party you had any sinister purpose. I did not intimate—nor do I think—that you are a bad man, nor a vicious one. Nor do I think you either a big or an unselfish one. I think you, like most of us, are just about as good as you know how to be. Nevertheless, I do not believe it a healthful or a happy thing for the Democratic Party to permit you or any other man to so completely keep it financially, and I think you are a little out of focus or you would not have gone as far as you have, even though the money means little to you.

I particularly do not believe the party's chances for success in 1932 are enhanced by the condition in which you have put it by such extraordinary generosity. It wasn't necessary for you to save it to that extent. It would have lasted. You seem greatly aggrieved at my statement that you were a Republican until 1928 and that you voted for Hughes, Harding, and Coolidge. That statement was made many times in practically every paper in the country in 1928. This is the first time I have ever seen a denial from you. You say in one breath it isn't true and in the next that you did vote for a Republican President. You do not say you did not vote for more than one, though that is the idea you try to convey. I don't withdraw it because I am unconvinced, but it isn't important. You may or you may not have been a Republican. That does not affect the fact that you are the first-mortgage holder of the Democratic Party to-day, and in my judgment that is not a good thing.

As a Democrat who has not yet scratched a Democratic ticket and does not expect to; as a Democrat who voted for Al Smith in 1928 and expects to vote for a Democrat in 1932; as a Democrat whose people were voting for Democratic candidates in Maryland before those ancestors you refer to knew there was such a State or such a party—as that sort of Democrat, I don't like the idea of the Democratic Party owing you so much money. Even if I didn't know you, I wouldn't like it. It gives a Democrat an unpleasant and uncomfortable feeling. The Democratic Party ought not to let any rich man so completely finance its activities and pay its bills. It isn't self-respecting and it isn't democratic and it isn't good.

You say that ultimately you expect the Democratic Party to pay you back the money you have loaned. I think you are optimistic and not sincere about that. However, as a Democrat I am so completely convinced that it would be so much of a help to the Democratic Party in the next campaign to pay you off and get rid of you that, though I am not a rich man, I will very cheerfully contribute to that end.

I haven't space here to take up in detail the many misstatements you make in your letter, nor to show the hollow character of your denials. You know perfectly well I did not "liken the Democratic Party to a harlot." You know perfectly well, too, that I did not imply that you had become a Democrat because of your religion and because Smith is a Roman Catholic. You know perfectly well that I hate bigots as bitterly as you and have fought them with a clearer conscience. You know that part of your letter is rot. You are not dumb and you know better. If I thought you meant this cheap stuff I would tell you it is a contemptible falsehood, without a shadow of justification or excuse. I would add that it was made in a contemptible way and that in making it you measure up to the lowest known political tradition. I prefer to think that this idea was put in by whoever wrote that letter for you—that it isn't your own, but you took it. I don't

want to regard you as that type of man. At any rate, it makes me sure Charley Michelson didn't write the letter for you. He would have done a better job.

Very sincerely,

FRANK R. KENT.

JOHN J. RASKOB,  
Chairman Democratic National Committee,  
Washington, D. C.

P. S.—One thing—and only one thing—in my article I want to retract. That is the statement that Mr. Hunt is Mr. Shouse's brother-in-law. I was incorrectly informed and apologize to them both.

#### RECESS

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, January 16, 1931, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### NOMINATIONS

*Executive nominations received by the Senate January 15 (legislative day of January 5), 1931*

##### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Frank Martinez, of New York, to be United States attorney, district of Porto Rico, to succeed John L. Gay, resigned.

##### APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY

###### MEDICAL CORPS

###### To be first lieutenants

First Lieut. Harold Hanson Twitchell, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from January 9, 1931.

First Lieut. Kenneth George Gould, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from January 9, 1931.

First Lieut. Richard Love Daniel, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from January 9, 1931.

First Lieut. Thomas James Hartford, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from January 9, 1931.

First Lieut. Paul Herbert Martin, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from January 9, 1931.

First Lieut. Saunders Murray, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from January 9, 1931.

First Lieut. William Henry Christian, jr., Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from January 9, 1931.

First Lieut. Otto Leonard Churney, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from January 9, 1931.

First Lieut. Henry Clay Chenault, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from January 9, 1931.

##### APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE ARMY

###### TO FIELD ARTILLERY

Lieut. Col. Sherman Miles, Coast Artillery Corps (detached in General Staff Corps), with rank from August 24, 1929.

##### PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY

###### To be colonels

Lieut. Col. Richard Wilde Walker, Cavalry, from January 9, 1931.

Lieut. Col. Carl Carlton Jones, Quartermaster Corps, from January 14, 1931.

###### To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. William Ducachet Geary, Field Artillery, from January 9, 1931.

Maj. Emil Pehr Pierson, Cavalry, from January 14, 1931, subject to examination required by law.

###### To be majors

Capt. Robert Graham Forsythe, Signal Corps, from January 9, 1931.

Capt. Orsen Everett Paxton, Infantry, from January 14, 1931.

###### To be captains

First Lieut. George Washington Polk, jr., Air Corps, from January 9, 1931.

First Lieut. Francis Herron Jack, jr., Infantry, from January 9, 1931.

First Lieut. Devereux Maitland Myers, Air Corps, from January 11, 1931.

First Lieut. Alfred Warrington Marriner, Air Corps, from January 14, 1931.

First Lieut. Guy Harrison Gale, Air Corps, from January 14, 1931.

###### To be first lieutenants

Second Lieut. Meredith Cornwell Noble, Infantry, from January 9, 1931.

Second Lieut. George Henry McManus, jr., Field Artillery, from January 9, 1931.

Second Lieut. Leo Francis Kengla, jr., Infantry, from January 11, 1931.

Second Lieut. Robert Emmett Burns, Signal Corps, from January 12, 1931.

Second Lieut. John Amos Hall, Infantry, from January 14, 1931.

Second Lieut. Donald Janzer Bailey, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 14, 1931, subject to examination required by law.

##### DENTAL CORPS

###### To be major

Capt. Clarence Constantin Olson, Dental Corps, from January 10, 1931.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 15, 1931

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Merciful God, we thank Thee that to-day offers another opportunity for service. It is more—we would have it a new life-confessing dependence upon divine grace and entering upon an avowed devotion to our country's welfare. In public and in private life may we be strong, noble-minded, sweet-tempered, and loving-hearted, always with fresh delight in our labors. If lulled into carelessness, arouse us to manly vigor; and if we cherish any bitterness, permit us not to be overpowered by it. Above all achievements is the wonder of wonders and the marvelous possibility open to us, namely, in spirit and in deed we can reflect the example of the great Teacher. Our Father, parallel our pathway, and Thine shall be the glory. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

##### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 447) entitled "Joint resolution making an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the public resolution entitled 'Joint resolution for the relief of farmers in the drought and/or storm stricken areas of the United States,' approved December 20, 1930," and had receded from its amendments numbered 1 and 2 to said joint resolution.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. REED and Mr. FLETCHER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the War Department.

##### THE CHRISTIE TANK

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the famous Christie tank is at the east door of the Capitol and will be there until about 2.30 this afternoon for the

inspection of Members of the Congress. This is, perhaps, the most modern and important fighting implement that has been invented since the war, and I personally—and I know I speak for the other members of the subcommittee—would like for every Member of the House to see it.

#### POST OFFICE AND TREASURY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 14246) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, further insist upon disagreement to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand there are one or two items that the conferees have refused to approve in conference.

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the scope of those provisions?

Mr. WOOD. There are several controversial items. One is with reference to an appropriation for an air line from the United States to Mexico City; another an appropriation of \$750,000 for an air line from St. Paul to Seattle; and another is the salary increases.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman does not mean to say that the Senate is insisting on additional appropriations for the air mail service in addition to the amounts incorporated in the bill?

Mr. WOOD. That is what they are doing.

Mr. STAFFORD. The appropriation for the line to Mexico City is in addition to the \$7,000,000 which we appropriated, although it was shown that the receipts from air mail for foreign service is only \$332,000. We are appropriating \$7,000,000 as a pure subsidy for the carriage of mail from foreign ports like Cristobal to Pernambuco.

Mr. WOOD. We are further insisting on disagreement to that provision.

Mr. STAFFORD. I hope the House conferees will continue to insist until next December.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WOOD, THATCHER, HARDY, WELSH of Pennsylvania, BYRNS, and ARNOLD.

#### AMERICA'S INTEREST IN THE BANK FOR INTERNATIONAL SETTLEMENTS

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing an address delivered by myself at Providence, R. I., night before last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following speech delivered by me Tuesday evening, January 13, 1931, before the Economic Club, of Providence, R. I.:

For nearly a year now the Bank for International Settlements, which in its conception was to have a corporate being free from political control by any sovereign power, has been able to enjoy corporate existence and enter upon its unique functions because the sovereign state of Switzerland generously consented to become its creator.

It was created in this normal and prosaic way because, however, portentous its advent upon the human scene may be, miraculous birth did not seem feasible for it to the members of the Young Committee in 1929. Switzerland was selected as its parent because the thought of its birth and growth from youth to maturity taking place at London aroused such ineradicable apprehensions at Paris, and the thought of such growth taking place at Paris aroused such precisely similar apprehensions at London, that some sovereign power which was not suspect had to be chosen.

Every bank exists by virtue of the physical protection which the state which creates it gives to it. Policemen or gendarme patrol its approaches, and if need be the military forces of the state intervene to guard its treasures against the depredations of marauders. The reciprocal obligation follows of loyalty and obedience on the part of the bank to the will of its sovereign creator and to it alone.

The Swiss are a redoubtable people. Surrounded through the centuries by warlike and aggressive powers, they have expelled every incursion of the foreigner into their mountain fastnesses

and maintained their independence unimpaired. They would be quick to oppose any aggression from without.

Swiss honor also is unimpeachable, and the bank's directors may therefore rest easy as to the safety of the funds within its vaults, even though those funds would necessarily be at the disposal of the Swiss state.

Should an aggressive European power, or a coalition of powers, threaten a raid upon those vaults, the entire military force of Switzerland may be depended upon to die to the last man in its defense as they did at Morgarten or St. Jacques.

This is a heavy responsibility for the world to ask the state of Switzerland to accept. But the responsibility may be greatly lightened if the bulk of the gold stocks of the bank may, by arrangement, be left on deposit in Paris or London, so that, for the most part, gold transfers may be effected by mere book entries as is the custom of the central bank of a sovereign state in making transfers of gold between private domestic banks. In such case the total amount of the treasure in the vaults of the bank at Basel might be very small, and it would not be necessary for the promising Swiss youth to pour out its blood upon the steps of the bank.

In such case, also, the strength of the bank will rest upon moral prestige and not upon the support of physical force except such as in an exceptional case the League of Nations might marshal for its protection. So highly does our Federal reserve system esteem the moral prestige of the bank that it has already parted with some of its high officials in order that they may become officers of the Bank for International Settlements and contribute their talents to the bank's success.

It is said that the Federal reserve system puts such great confidence in it that it may entrust a large part of its gold to the custody of the bank, thus obviating the frequent shipment of bullion across the Atlantic in either direction and greatly facilitating international transfer of funds.

As to the safety of the gold, besides the redoubtable guardianship of the Swiss Government, the League of Nations could, at need, marshal the collective military force of Europe against any aggressor who, in defiance of a decision of the World Court, might seek to seize it by force. Thus, whatever stocks of gold we entrusted to the Bank for International Settlements would be under the protection of the council of the League of Nations.

In case our Federal reserve bank requested a gold credit, or shipment of gold which we had on deposit in the Bank for International Settlements, and this became a matter of dispute, and the latter bank felt that it must refuse to make the transfer, the American interests could file suit in the World Court, and the Council of the League of Nations could be depended on to put any decision of that court into execution.

While it is a legal truism that possession is nine points of the law, and while possession of the disputed gold in such a case would be held in Europe, the moral and judicial majesty of the World Court will be such that it would be unthinkable for the American litigants to question the decision.

Thus, these beneficent institutions of an enlightened age insure the settlement of all financial differences between the United States and the states of Europe by peaceful means.

I do not desire to make an address here, gentlemen, in an ironical vein. My position in regard to the Bank for International Settlements is known. America should have no more interest in this bank than it has in the Bank of England, the Bank of France, the Reichsbank, or the Bank of Turkey. The function of the Federal reserve system is to protect the gold and regulate the currency of the United States, and its foreign contacts should be only incidental to this purpose. Political motives, such as financial aid in establishing or strengthening any political power in Europe, or financial pressure to compel action by some other political organism in Europe, ought not to be within the authority of the Federal reserve system.

I have spoken frequently during the past year, in Congress and elsewhere, upon the tendency of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York to blaze an independent trail by establishing and developing extensive contacts abroad for which it has no authorization in law, and of the deleterious effects of its policies upon our domestic conditions. I have covered the ground quite fully and in that connection have warned against its efforts to involve us in the world bank created by the Young plan.

The banking system of a state is such as the state chooses to set up. To coin money and regulate its value is an attribute of sovereign power, and in the exercise of this power the state establishes its banking system. If the state abandons control of its banking system to others it quickly ceases to be sovereign, for those who control the nation's wealth control the nation. Within the banking system of a sovereign state mutual aid and credit extensions among banks may be carried to great lengths for these funds all remain under the control of the state. This is not true as to foreign banks, and the extension of credits to a foreign state or bank ought not to be exercised at the independent will of the banking system. They ought to be matters for decision by sovereign authority.

We established the Federal reserve system a few months before the war broke out in Europe, and thereby created a centralized control of currency and the use of credit. Each of the 12 Federal reserve banks was to regulate credit in its district according to the needs there, and the activities of the reserve banks were to be coordinated under the supervision of the Federal Reserve Board at Washington.

The banks were given the power to buy and sell gold abroad, but it was the intention of the makers of the Federal reserve

act that this power should be merely incidental to the primary purpose of affording proper credit facilities to American citizens. The Federal reserve act did not contemplate the needs of the foreigner; it contemplated the needs of the American people solely.

But no sooner was the act passed and the Federal reserve system set in operation than the war in Europe broke out and exerted a profound influence upon our financial structure. The Federal reserve system became the vehicle for the transfer of vast funds from Europe to America, and especially after we entered the war for the transfer of vast sums of American wealth to Europe. These transfers were nearly all made through the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. This expansion of the purposes of the Federal reserve system was made by the authority of the Government in Washington and was necessitated by the exigencies of war.

After we entered the war the successive Liberty and Victory loans raised the necessary billions through subscription by the people. The billions destined for Europe were, as it were, drawn into a vast funnel whose mouth was the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and from there poured across the Atlantic. This raised the international bankers of New York who were representing foreign governments to a dizzy eminence of financial power and created the most intimate contacts between the agents of the respective financial powers in New York, London, and Paris. The sense of unity with our associated nations in the war found its highest expression in the trans-Atlantic contacts established by these New York bankers. A roomy financial conduit had been constructed across the Atlantic through which the entire liquid wealth of either hemisphere might easily be transferred to the other, provided those who controlled the wealth so desired.

That roomy financial conduit still exists as it was created in war time. After performing its war functions it served again from 1921 to 1924 for the great flow of gold metal westward when Europe made a belated settlement of its vast unpaid trade balance.

When that service was completed the function of this trans-Atlantic financial conduit, this feat of financial engineering, should have come to an end. Having served its war purpose, it should have been dismantled. It is too roomy for peace purposes. Its potentialities are as great as would be those of a tunnel from the United States to Europe built of stone and mortar. A reconsideration of the Federal reserve act ought to have been undertaken in 1925 and legislation effected to curb the powers of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. As it was not done then, it is urgently needed now. Only a subordinate governmental agency in its nature, the Federal reserve system, dominated by a group of New York international bankers, is now claiming the right to exercise its powers independent of governmental control. It resents the suggestion of action by the Congress to regulate its functions and it aspires to assert equality with, or superiority over, the sovereign Government of the United States.

Suppose the Congress of the United States yields to these claims. History, particularly recent history, shows that the great financiers are able to insinuate their agents into high place with each incoming administration and to control both the State and Treasury Departments. They dominate the policies of the executive branch. If the Congress through the influence of the financial power over it becomes unable to regulate the banking system of the country and thus to curb an autocratic financial power, the political Government at Washington will cease to be a sovereign power and will become but the agent of an irresponsible and world-wide financial autocracy.

And to what uses would the roomy, war-time financial conduit across the Atlantic be put? Those superfineanciers who assume to tell us what is best for us, citizens of the United States as they are, are already saying that a redistribution of the great gold stock of the United States is urgently needed. Assume that, fascinated by these masterful voices, the citizenship of this country interposes no obstacle and permits them to have their way. Before any belated voices might rise in alarmed protest, the deed would be done, and the Eastern Hemisphere would again be dominant through the power of gold. The great savings-bank deposits of the American people would shrink, credit, no longer a common utility, would become the rich man's privilege, money would be scarce and poverty common; or if the effort were made to furnish more currency than the attenuated gold base warranted, there would be the eternal vexation of monetary troubles.

Economics is not one thing and politics another. If this great change were brought about by the financiers, it would be the most stupendous political coup that the world ever saw. Nearly all the currency of this country is now in the possession of the great New York banks. Banks elsewhere and the people hold depreciated securities and can not find the funds needed for legitimate business. This currency ought to go back to the banks of the country and to the people in order that the great internal trade of the country may be stimulated and the great domestic market resume its activity. Gathered into the vaults of New York, this collective liquid wealth of the American people lies entirely too conveniently near to the western mouth of the roomy, war-time financial conduit to Europe.

We know what the money loaned to Europe in the war went for. It went to pay for things which were being consumed in the holocaust of war. Steadily the long-accumulated wealth flowed out of Europe to pay for what the war was continuously burning up. First, they spent their ready cash; then they sold their vast holdings abroad to secure new credits; then, after we entered the war, they borrowed \$11,000,000,000 from us.

No bullion shipments were made on account of trade balance after we entered the war, and it was because Europe was very slow to make these shipments after the war ended that we suffered the credit stringency which produced our hard times of 1920 and 1921. It was only after the allied states were forced to settle their trade balance in gold that the credit base of our financial structure was broadened by the acquisition of an adequate gold stock that restored our banking system to a normal condition. It was only after the exportation of this gold from Europe took place also that the poverty to which the war had reduced all the states of Europe became apparent. It was not until then that realization came in the United States that Europe was impoverished and that the United States had become by far the wealthiest country in the world.

Why should responsible authority seek, as it has done for years, to conceal from public knowledge the simple explanation of the great accumulation of our postwar wealth? That accumulation of wealth is due essentially to the fact that from 1921 to 1924 there was a steady flow of gold coming into our ports chiefly from Europe or on European account, reaching by the end of the third year the figure of more than \$2,000,000,000. This bullion became gold reserves in the banks and furnished an amount of good currency adequate to the needs of the vigorous industrial population of our continent. Yet a few years ago a great commission of economists appointed by political authority to determine the causes of our postwar prosperity wholly ignored this single definite cause and ascribed it vaguely to "acceleration, spread, and tempo."

Why should they not have been honest and courageous about it? If the public understood the specific cause for our postwar wealth, and realizing the magnitude of that wealth, would it not have a better understanding of the question of debts and reparations?

How could such a stupendous paroxysm of warfare, lasting for nearly five years and exhausting every resource of the entire continent of Europe, have failed to bring a profound change in the world? Its economic consequences were manifested with singular clearness by those steady shipments westward across the Atlantic from 1912 to 1924 of more than 4,000 tons of gold metal. Vast as have been these shipments of gold, they still leave Europe in our debt; she still owes us the \$11,000,000,000 of public debts which we loaned her in the war, and in addition approximately four billions in private debts contracted since the war ended. Why do not our economists, public and private, acknowledge that it is the acquisition of our great postwar gold stock that explains the economic power of the American Republic to-day and that, if we relinquished possession of our gold, our economic power would wane. Whence came the "acceleration, spread, and tempo" which the committee on economic changes found to be the cause of American prosperity?

The war in Europe must be viewed from one of two opposed standpoints, and in accordance with the view from one of these standpoints the great financial and economic decisions of to-day must be made, fixing the course of history for centuries to come.

In the first view, the war in Europe brought an era of history to a close. It transferred the center of civilization's power from the Eastern Hemisphere to the Western. It made a new and different conception of cultural life predominant in the world.

In the second view, the war in Europe changed nothing permanently. It brought greater temporary exhaustion to Europe than any previous war had done, but recuperation will take place with increasing rapidity and Europe will regain its former relative position in the world.

If the view from the first standpoint prevails, the United States will retain and protect its gold stock and utilizing its resulting economic power in the way it judges best, and Europe will acquiesce in this decision.

If the second view prevails, the American people will regard their possession of \$4,000,000,000 in gold as incidental and transitory and acquiesce more or less actively in its redistribution among those who held it before the war. They will suffer the consequent lowering of their economic power with equanimity. Europe will quickly regain possession of it, and with it of the economic and political vigor which characterized that continent before the war.

The struggle goes on between the two sides. Its evidences have been plainly visible during the past decade.

I do not see how any administration in Washington could fail to adopt the first view unequivocally. I do not see how any administration could justify itself for adopting the second. Under any circumstances, it would have no right to adopt and act upon the second view until the question had been made a political issue and the will of the people had been expressed. In a democratic republic, great and vital questions of foreign policy are not to be considered and decided in secret by a handful of men in temporary office in Washington. The people of the Republic have the right to determine their own destiny.

The peoples and governments of Europe are impoverished. They wish and insist that we should pool our wealth with them in order that the pre-war balance may be reestablished. It is too much to ask of us, and the issue should be squarely met. It should be made clear once and for all that the gold stock of the United States is to remain here permanently to water the garden of American industrial life. And it should be made clear also that it is in this way that the United States can make its greatest contribution to the world's civilization.

It is because the statesmen of Europe have for 12 years rejected this reality and have tortured their brains with schemes for effect-

ing the quick return to Europe of its lost gold that no progress in reconstruction has been made. I have recently analyzed the Stresemann policy, which for years all Europe has been pressing and have shown how under it Europe was to be made over again in a few years' time through the acquisition of billions of dollars realized by the sale in the United States of German reparation bonds, and I have shown the more than dubious moral and legal quality of those bonds.

That such a scheme could have been openly pressed by our own leading financiers, and surreptitiously aided by successive administrations in Washington, as it has been, until it has actually reached dangerous proportions for us, is sufficient evidence that it is time for the Congress and public opinion to interest themselves in establishing proper control over our foreign relations.

The surreptitious support of this policy by the State and Treasury Departments has continued for years. When the peace conference convened in Paris after the war, the American delegation was accompanied by a hundred eminent scholars with a library of 10,000 books. Attachés of the American delegation sprang, as it were, from the ground to accord their valuable aid in one or another phase of the work to be done. But the men who emerged from this intellectual welter to sit in the inner councils of the conference and guide the steps of the American delegation were a selected group of the international bankers of New York.

Hand and glove they worked with the internationalists of Europe. The Europeans molded the treaty to suit themselves, and the American financiers persuaded the American delegation to sign it.

The treaty provided for reparations afterwards fixed at \$33,000,000,000, and Annex II to the reparation clauses provided that this sum might be capitalized by the Allied Governments and sold as bonds to purchasers on the world's investment markets. If the bonds could be successfully marketed, France would receive about \$16,000,000,000 in cash, Britain six or seven billions, and the smaller allies lesser sums.

The purpose of this provision, as subsequent events have proved, was to sell the bonds in the United States chiefly, which would thus pay the German indemnity to the Allies in cash, and look to Germany for reimbursement. If the scheme could have been executed in its pristine brightness, Europe would have been over the effects of the war in 10 years time, and the United States would not have retained its postwar wealth. The roomy, wartime financial conduit was there to facilitate this great transaction.

This provision in Annex II, the financial bankers of New York induced the American delegation to the Peace Conference to accept.

This purpose remains to-day the dominant motive of European diplomacy and politics and the preoccupation of the New York bankers. It found a medium of action in the Stresemann policy of 1925 which has culminated in the launching on our markets of the German international 5½ bonds, which I discussed recently in the House of Representatives. Fortunately, we seem to be taking warning against these bonds in time.

Having gotten the provisions of Annex II into the treaty, the international bankers of New York came home to work on this side to put it into execution. The refusal of the Senate to ratify the treaty was a great setback, but the efforts went on just the same. After 1921 the bankers attained control of the State Department and the Treasury Department and have never relaxed their grip upon the policies of these departments. Putting the Stresemann policy into execution in the United States could not be openly accomplished. Its purposes could not be openly avowed. The State and Treasury Departments were in sympathy with it but did not dare publicly to avow this sympathy. They were reduced to the practice of roundabout and rather surreptitious methods to further, gradually, the purposes of the international bankers and the European governments. The State Department has exercised unseen a definite support of the treaty of Versailles in Europe, and the Treasury Department has not made the slightest effort to check the growth of unwarranted practices and powers in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. In all really important negotiations concerning our European relations the State Department has left action to private bankers instead of to the responsible officials.

It secretly favored what was done by the Young committee in 1929, and in order that the Young plan might go into operation without the necessity of treaty settlements which would involve consideration of the whole matter by Congress, it made a special agreement with Germany concerning the German debt to us without which the Young plan could not have been adopted, and which required only a joint resolution of Congress approving it with reference to which general and open debate on the floors of the Congress on the whole subject did not need to be risked. The Young plan in its far-reaching significance falls within the purview of the Congress. It ought to have been fully considered there. But in order that this might be obviated and publicity avoided, the leaders of the organization in Congress in both Houses were summoned to the White House on May 19, 1929, while the Young committee was sitting in Paris, and there induced to agree to what was being done in Europe and to promise favorable action in both the Senate and House of Representatives. The result was that inquiry by individual Senators and Congressmen was smothered when the matter came up for action last year, and a matter which should have had the closest consideration by the Congress was railroaded through without debate.

Gentlemen, it is this subtle influence in every branch of our Government at Washington that is now a menace to the Nation's

welfare. It is undoubtedly present and its results are visible. All its purposes converge upon a control of the Federal reserve system and of the political government at Washington, in order that national policy may be controlled by a few men and in the interests primarily of the foreigner. The only way to bring this condition to an end is by action in the Congress where alone the interests of the people are represented.

Now, in closing, let me say that under no circumstances ought the Congress or the people to allow the United States Government to be drawn slowly and by courses which can not be detected by a scrutiny of the public press into virtual alliance with the allied states for the maintenance of the status quo in Europe as it is to-day. Under no circumstances ought the ground be prepared for another American intervention in Europe's wars.

The Bank of International Settlements and the World Court are destined to be the financial and judicial part of the League of Nations.

#### MUSCLE SHOALS

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD telegrams received from some of my constituents with reference to Muscle Shoals.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

PONTIAC, MICH., January 10, 1931.

GRANT HUDSON, Congressman:

Our people wish to voice our opposition to Government entering into further public-utility investment and extension of transmission lines, especially referring to Muscle Shoals project.

CRAMER SMITH, President.

[Telegram]

DETROIT, MICH., January 12, 1931.

HON. GRANT M. HUDSON,

House of Representatives:

As one of your constituents I strongly urge that you oppose Norris Muscle Shoals bill or any like bill that would cause Government to enter business in competition with private capital.

JOSEPH J. McFAWN,

Vice President Cray, McFawn & Co.

[Telegram]

PONTIAC, MICH., January 12, 1931.

Representative GRANT HUDSON,

House of Representatives:

I think the Federal Government ought to keep out of operating Muscle Shoals. Wouldn't this establish a dangerous precedent?

HAROLD A. FITZGERALD.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PARKS. It is with profound sorrow I feel it is my duty to announce to the Speaker that there is not a quorum here, and I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas makes the point of order there is not a quorum present. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 15]

Aldrich	Cullen	Johnson, Ind.	Reid, Ill.
Auf der Heide	Dempsey	Johnson, Okla.	Rowbottom
Baird	Dorsey	Johnson, S. Dak.	Shaffer, Va.
Beck	Doughton	Jonas, N. C.	Simms
Bell	Douglass, Mass.	Kearns	Sirovich
Blackburn	Doyle	Kelly	Smith, W. Va.
Britten	Fenn	Kemp	Sproul, Kans.
Browne	Fish	Kennedy	Stevenson
Brunner	Fitzpatrick	Kerr	Stobbs
Buckbee	Garrett	Kunz	Sullivan, N. Y.
Butler	Gavagan	McKeown	Sullivan, Pa.
Cable	Golder	Mansfield	Taylor, Colo.
Canfield	Hale	Michaelson	Taylor, Tenn.
Carley	Hastings	Montet	Thompson
Carter, Wyo.	Hawley	Nelson, Wis.	Underwood
Celler	Hoch	Norton	Warren
Chase	Hoffman	O'Connor, La.	Whitehead
Clancy	Hope	O'Connor, N. Y.	Williams
Corning	Hudspeth	Owen	Zihlman
Culkin	James, Mich.	Purnell	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and fifty-two Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

#### ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15593, the Army appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15593, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### CITIZENS' MILITARY TRAINING RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

For the procurement, maintenance, and issue, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, to institutions at which one or more units of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps are maintained, of such public animals, means of transportation, supplies, tentage, equipment, and uniforms as he may deem necessary, including cleaning and laundering of uniforms and clothing at camps; and to forage, at the expense of the United States, public animals so issued, and to pay commutation in lieu of uniforms at a rate to be fixed annually by the Secretary of War; for transporting said animals and other authorized supplies and equipment from place of issue to the several institutions and training camps and return of same to place of issue when necessary; for purchase of training manuals, including Government publications and blank forms; for the establishment and maintenance of camps for the further practical instruction of the members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for transporting members of such corps to and from such camps, and to subsist them while traveling to and from such camps and while remaining therein so far as appropriations will permit or, in lieu of transporting them to and from such camps and subsisting them while en route, to pay them travel allowance at the rate of 5 cents per mile for the distance by the shortest usually traveled route from the places from which they are authorized to proceed to the camp and for the return travel thereto, and to pay the return travel pay in advance of the actual performance of the travel; for expenses incident to the use, including upkeep and depreciation costs, of supplies, equipment, and materiel furnished in accordance with law from stocks under the control of the War Department; for pay for students attending advanced camps at the rate prescribed for soldiers of the seventh grade of the Regular Army; for the payment of commutation of subsistence to members of the senior division of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, at a rate not exceeding the cost of the garrison ration prescribed for the Army, as authorized in the act approved June 3, 1916, as amended by the act approved June 4, 1920 (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 387); for medical and hospital treatment until return to their homes and further medical treatment after arrival at their homes, subsistence during hospitalization and until furnished transportation to their homes, and transportation when fit for travel to their homes of members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps who suffer personal injury in line of duty while en route to or from and while at camps of instruction under the provisions of section 47a of the national defense act approved June 3, 1916 (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 441), as amended; and for the cost of preparation and transportation to their homes and burial expenses of the remains of members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps who die while attending camps of instruction as provided in the act approved April 26, 1928 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 10, sec. 451); for mileage, traveling expenses, or transportation, for transportation of dependents, and for packing and transportation of baggage, as authorized by law, for officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army traveling on duty pertaining to or on detail to or relief from duty with the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; for the maintenance, repair, and operation of motor vehicles, and for the purchase of 7 motor-propelled trucks, 4 at a cost not exceeding \$2,000 each, and 3 at a cost not exceeding \$750 each, including for both types the value of a vehicle exchanged, \$3,960,000, of which \$368,047 shall be available immediately: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War is authorized to issue, without charge, in lieu of purchase, for the use of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, so many horses now belonging to the Regular Army as he may consider desirable: *Provided*, That uniforms and other equipment or material issued to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps in accordance with law shall be furnished from surplus or reserve stocks of the War Department without payment from this appropriation, except for actual expense incurred in the manufacture or issue: *Provided further*,

That in no case shall the amount paid from this appropriation for uniforms, equipment, or material furnished to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps from stocks under the control of the War Department be in excess of the price current at the time the issue is made: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used for the organization or maintenance of an additional number of mounted, motor transport, or tank units in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps in excess of the number in existence on January 1, 1928: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated elsewhere in this act, except for printing and binding and pay and allowances of officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, shall be used for expenses in connection with the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I present the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 55, line 25, before the period, insert " : *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used for or toward the support of any compulsory military course or military training in any civil school or college, or for the pay of any officer, enlisted man, or employee at any civil school or college where a military course or military training is compulsory, but nothing herein shall be construed as applying to essentially military schools or colleges."

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to the Chair in a cursory reading of the amendment that it is a negative limitation.

Mr. BARBOUR. It is in the form of a limitation, but one of those limitations that seeks to control the discretion of an administrative officer. It does not limit any fund carried in this bill, it does not mean that there will be any less money expended for these activities, because a change of the entire activity from compulsory military training to voluntary requires exactly the same amount of money to be expended.

It is one of those amendments offered in the form of a limitation which seeks to change existing legislation, and as I said a moment ago restricts the Executive discretion of an administrative officer.

On that point I would like to call the attention of the Chair to certain rulings with which the Chair is familiar, on the general proposition that legislation can not be proposed under the guise of an amendment.

These schools are provided for in the national defense act. This training, compulsory or elective, is provided for in that act. The amendment seeks to change that to the extent that we shall not have any compulsory military training in the schools even though the school executives want it.

Now, particularly, I want to call the attention of the Chair to a ruling by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE], who was in the chair during the Sixty-eighth Congress, second session, and which will be found on page 1497:

The Chair believes he should look through the form to the purpose. So doing, he finds the purpose to be legislative in that the intent is to restrict Executive discretion to a degree that may be fairly termed a change in policy rather than a matter of administrative detail. For this reason he feels it incumbent on himself to sustain the point of order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is clearly a limitation. Assuming, for the sake of argument only, that what the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR] says is a fact, that money is paid to schools where the training is compulsory, then I submit that that is a violation of the national defense act, which is entirely bare of any compulsory military training, and, to the contrary, specifically provides for voluntary military training. Clearly the decisions are numerous, and there is no question that an amendment which places a limitation on the expenditure of public funds is in order. The Chair will recall that during the discussion of the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia an amendment was placed in the bill limiting the qualifications of teachers in the public schools of the District, entirely contrary to the provisions of existing law, yet that amendment was held to be in order. If my amendment should be held to be out of order, then it would be nullifying all of the precedents of years in this House in respect to amendments that are limitations on appropriation bills.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman answer the Chair in respect to the last part of his amendment, as to whether that does not add additional duties to an executive officer?—

But nothing herein shall be construed as applying to essentially military schools or colleges.

Does not that require an examination into the character of the schools, as to whether or not they are essentially military schools, and does not that add another duty to an executive officers? Will the gentleman address himself to that?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Not at all. They are classified as such. For instance, there are private schools like the Culver Military Academy or the Staunton Military Academy. I refer to schools or colleges like State universities or other colleges that are not typically military academies. The War Department itself has made this qualification, and if the Chair should hold that I would be willing to strike that portion out. There can be no doubt as to that. That proviso meets the very objection that the gentleman from California states in his point of order. They are purely military colleges. The student who goes there goes with his eyes open and he goes for that purpose. I am taking no appropriation away from those schools. I think there can be no question as to the propriety of that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] is in the form of a negative limitation. It is assumed that it is now authorized by law to appropriate for compulsory military courses or military training in civil schools or colleges. It is also authorized by law to pay an officer, an enlisted man, or an employee at a civil school or college where military training or courses are compulsory. The Chair is unable to find any affirmative direction in this amendment. In effect, it simply refuses to appropriate for purposes which are authorized by law and for which Congress may or may not appropriate as it may see fit. The Chair is constrained to overrule the point of order, because he is unable to find any affirmative direction or any limitation of authority of an executive officer other than a refusal to appropriate for certain purposes for which there is authority of law and for which Congress has heretofore appropriated. It does to a certain extent change a policy of the War Department, but the Chair believes that a change of policy can be made by the failure of Congress to appropriate for an authorized object. The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to make good to the people of this country statements that have repeatedly been made on the floor of this House, statements made by the War Department, by the Secretary of War, and I believe in several instances by the Presidents of the United States, that we have no compulsory military training in this country. The gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR] himself has solemnly assured the country in statements made on the floor of this House that we, the Federal Government, have no compulsory military training and that we do not appropriate for such a thing. He has often stated that he is not in favor of compulsory military training. That being so, all my amendment does is to restrict the appropriations to such schools where military training is not compulsory. That is all it does. It does not take one cent away from the clearly essential military schools, because if a boy wants to go to that kind of a school he goes there with the desire to obtain military training. If Congress wants to provide funds for such private schools, it can do so. If private military schools get any aid or appropriation from the Federal Government, my amendment does not disturb those schools; but in State schools, maintained by the States, or colleges where boys go, we should carry out the spirit of the national defense act, that the military training shall be optional. That is all there is to it. It will not take one cent away from any school or college where the training is optional, and, as I said before, we have declared to the country that we are appropriating this money for schools where the military training is optional. We have to keep faith with the people of the country. If any school compels its students to follow these courses in

order to obtain Federal aid, then they have no complaint if we limit the funds to be appropriated or expended in accordance with the spirit of the law and the intention of Congress.

I am merely following the lead of the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR], who has repeatedly stated that there is nothing in the law or the appropriation where military training is compulsory. I have waited patiently year after year. The gentleman is not at fault, the War Department is not at fault, the Congress is not at fault. Various schools and colleges are making military training compulsory. That being so, let us write the intention and spirit of the law into this appropriation and put an end to a system of compulsory military service in this country.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The gentleman speaks of an option. Who exercises that option?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The student himself, except in essentially military schools, like the Staunton Military Academy, Culver Academy, Virginia Military Institute, and other essentially military schools.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Suppose there is a high school in a city, and through the regulations of the city there is compulsory military training in that school. The school itself can not control it.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. No. But we can by refusing Federal aid and public funds out of the United States Treasury for that school.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The individual student can say whether he will participate or not.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. That is all. That is the purpose of my amendment.

Mr. McSWAIN. I would like very much to have the gentleman's definition of what he means by strictly or exclusively military school.

For instance, in South Carolina we have a school known as The Citadel, which has been in existence as a military school for over a hundred years.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. And the students wear uniforms all the time?

Mr. McSWAIN. Oh, yes; all the time. They have no other clothes with them.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. There is no question about that being a military school. It would not be affected by this amendment.

Mr. McSWAIN. What about the land-grant college—the Clemson Agricultural and Mechanical College—where they wear uniforms all the time just in the same way? They get up in the morning by the bugle and they go to bed by taps.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. It is not compulsory in the land-grant college. Am I not correct about that? I ask the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLLINS. It can be optional in the land-grant college.

Mr. BARBOUR. It is optional in the land-grant school.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Then my amendment would apply to land-grant schools.

Mr. YON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. YON. In Florida in the university there is a corps there and we have an officer in charge of training detailed to that school. What bearing would this amendment have on a school of that sort?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Is the training compulsory or voluntary? If it is voluntary, it would not affect it. If it is compulsory, it would get no funds under this amendment.

Mr. YON. If it is compulsory through the curriculum of the school?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Exactly. That is the purpose of my amendment, gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] has expired.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, because it seeks to limit or control the activities of schools and colleges throughout the country by a limitation on an appropriation bill without having gone into the matter and given the authorities of these

various schools and colleges an opportunity to be heard. It seeks to change the purpose and intent of the national defense act which provides, among other things, for the establishment of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps units.

The national defense act contains this provision:

That except at State institutions described in this section, no unit shall be established or maintained in an educational institution until the authorities of the same agree to establish and maintain a two years' elective or compulsory course of military training as a minimum for its physically fit male students, which course, when entered upon by any student, shall, as regards such student, be a prerequisite for graduation unless he is relieved of this obligation by regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

The national defense act leaves it entirely up to the school authorities to determine whether this training shall be elective or compulsory.

I think we should go a little slowly in changing this program that has been in effect for the past several years, ever since the enactment of the national defense act. It is a part of the whole scheme and program of maintaining something that is somewhere near an adequate national defense. I feel certain if any of the Members of this House have within the past three days read the first three chapters of General Pershing's experiences in the World War they will realize that these are matters about which we should proceed very slowly and be rather certain of our ground.

The effect of this amendment will be to wipe out of existence half or more than half of the existing Reserve

Officers' Training Corps units throughout the schools and colleges of the United States unless they immediately change their plan of military training from compulsory to elective. They can not benefit by one dollar of this appropriation if this amendment is adopted and they have compulsory military training.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is the gentleman in favor of compulsory military training?

Mr. BARBOUR. No. But, in so far as these schools are concerned, I am in favor of leaving it to the school authorities to determine what they want in the way of educational facilities for their students. I do not see anything terrible in requiring a high-school student to spend a little time in military training. I have been through that. It did not do any harm to me that I have ever been able to observe. It is good physical education. It straightens a man up and throws his shoulders back and deepens his chest and it is good for him in a physical way. Nobody has ever been known to suffer because he took a year or two of military training, either elective or compulsory. But it is a matter that should be left to the school authorities themselves, and we here in Washington should not try to control it.

I would like to call attention to some of the schools that will be affected by this. Let us take the First Corps Area, which is composed of the New England States, and then the other corps areas.

I shall insert a table showing just what schools and colleges will be affected.

List of schools and colleges having Reserve Officers' Training Corps units

	Elective or required military training	Total en- rolled	Drawing commutation		Receiving issue uniforms		Drawing neither	
			Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance
FIRST CORPS AREA								
Senior units								
Connecticut Agricultural College <sup>1</sup>	Required	288		41	247			
Yale University	Elective	271	162	107				2
University of Maine <sup>1</sup>	Required	622		32	590			
Boston University	Elective	528		37	491			
Harvard Medical School	do	86					43	43
Harvard University	do	224		54	148			22
Massachusetts Agricultural College <sup>1</sup>	Required	137		22	115			
Massachusetts Institute of Technology <sup>1</sup>	do	1,472		269	1,168			35
University of New Hampshire <sup>1</sup>	do	627		85	542			
Rhode Island State College <sup>1</sup>	do	312		41	271			
Norwich University	do	308		192	116			
University of Vermont <sup>1</sup>	do <sup>1</sup>	477		329	40		73	35
Total		5,352	683	844	3,572		116	137
Junior, class SM units								
Bangor High School	Required	288			288			
Gloucester High School	do	306			306			
New Bedford High School	Elective	170			170			
Total		764			764			
SECOND CORPS AREA								
Senior units								
University of Delaware <sup>1</sup>	Required	330		44	285			1
Princeton University	Elective	617	433	184				
Rutgers University <sup>1</sup>	Required	663		83	580			
Albany Medical College	do	84					65	19
College of the City of New York	Elective	963		63	900			
Cornell University <sup>1</sup>	Required	2,140	1,798	269			52	21
Fordham University	Elective	183		26	157			
New York University	Required	1,126		66	804		227	29
Syracuse University	Elective	451		77	374			
University of Buffalo	do	70					40	30
University of Porto Rico <sup>1</sup>	Required	387			358	29		
Total		7,014	2,231	812	3,458	29	384	100
Junior, class M units								
Bordentown Military Institute	Required	110					101	
La Salle Military Academy	do	151			151			
New York Military Academy	do	291					291	
The Manlius School	do	261					261	
Total		813			151		662	

<sup>1</sup>Land grant.

List of schools and colleges having Reserve Officers' Training Corps units—Continued

	Elective or required military training	Total en- rolled	Drawing commutation		Receiving issue uniforms		Drawing neither	
			Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance
THIRD CORPS AREA								
Senior units								
Georgetown University.....	Elective.....	458		38	223		157	40
George Washington University.....	do.....	166					103	63
Howard University.....	Required.....	305		49	256			
Johns Hopkins University.....	Elective.....	422	299	63			40	20
University of Maryland <sup>1</sup> .....	Required.....	586		48	538			
Western Maryland College.....	do.....	160	119	41				
Carnegie Institute of Technology.....	Elective.....	374		94	280			
Drexel Institute.....	Required.....	688		52	636			
Gettysburg College.....	Elective.....	170		26	144			
Jefferson Medical College.....	do.....	254					165	89
Lafayette College.....	do.....	207		26	181			
Lehigh University.....	Required.....	836			743	93		
Pennsylvania Military College.....	do.....	131					91	40
Pennsylvania State College <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	2,118		107	2,011			
University of Pennsylvania.....	Elective.....	613	161	71			259	122
University of Pittsburgh.....	do.....	590	346	60			126	58
Medical College of Virginia.....	do.....	103					55	48
Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical and Polytechnic Institute, <sup>1</sup>	Required.....	1,124	786	338				
Virginia Military Institute.....	do.....	673	442	231				
Total.....		9,978	2,133	1,244	5,012	93	996	480
Junior, class M units								
Valley Forge Military Academy.....	Required.....	209						209
Augusta Military Academy.....	do.....	272						272
Blackstone, a Military School for Boys.....	do.....	98						98
Fishburne Military School.....	do.....	133						133
Fork Union Military Academy.....	do.....	144						144
Massanutten Academy.....	do.....	116						116
Staunton Military Academy.....	do.....	516						516
Total.....		1,488						1,488
FOURTH CORPS AREA								
Senior units								
Alabama Polytechnic Institute <sup>1</sup> .....	Required.....	1,145	878	267				
University of Alabama.....	do.....	1,614	1,512	132				
University of Florida <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	1,208		140	1,068			
Georgia School of Technology.....	do.....	1,393	1,141	222				30
North Georgia Agriculture College.....	do.....	122			87	35		
University of Georgia <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	758		146	602			10
Louisiana State University <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	762	627	133			2	
Mississippi Agricultural and Mechanical College <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	836	689	147				
Davidson College.....	do.....	386		53	333			
North Carolina State College <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	891		123	768			
Clemson Agriculture College <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	1,106	745	360				
Presbyterian College.....	do.....	171	120	51				
The Citadel.....	do.....	500	332	242			14	2
Wofford College.....	Elective.....	237		90	147			
University of Tennessee <sup>1</sup> .....	Required.....	739	590	102			18	29
Vanderbilt University School of Medicine.....	Elective.....	115					67	48
Total.....		12,103	6,635	2,208	3,005	35	101	119

<sup>1</sup>Land grant.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does this amendment cut out the required colleges?

Mr. BARBOUR. All the required schools are just wiped out, and they will not get any of the money appropriated under this bill unless they change from compulsory to elective.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Then I am against the amendment.

Mr. BARBOUR. I want you gentlemen to know what the effect is going to be on your own institutions.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. In all fairness I think it should be stated that these schools could change their present system and make military training elective, and in that event they will enjoy the benefit of these appropriations.

Mr. BARBOUR. I say, unless they change from compulsory to elective training they will not get the benefit of these appropriations. I made that statement to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. CLARK of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Maryland. If military training is required, we will say, at Howard University, does that make

military training compulsory? In other words, no one has to go—

Mr. BARBOUR. To Howard University.

Mr. CLARK of Maryland. If a man goes to Howard University and knows that military training is required, can you say that is compulsory?

Mr. BARBOUR. I do not think so, any more than saying that higher algebra is compulsory or any other subject that is prescribed in the school curriculum. It would apply to one the same as to the other.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, before the regents of the University of Wisconsin—

Mr. BARBOUR. That is the institution which is always right, according to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, of course, the gentleman from New York knows more about it than anybody else.

Mr. BARBOUR. Except as to football.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would not except football. I would say that with respect to football it would be of superior rank. Before the regents of the University of Wisconsin made it optional for the students to take military training it was compulsory on everyone in that institution to take it by edict of the board of regents.

Mr. BARBOUR. Just the same as the students were required to take other subjects which are compulsory.

Mr. STAFFORD. Let me say to the gentleman from California that the trend of our colleges to-day is not to make anything compulsory.

Mr. BARBOUR. Let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that every other institution should have the same right as the University of Wisconsin and determine for itself whether the training should be compulsory or elective.

Mr. STAFFORD. As far as I am concerned, if I could, I would wipe out all appropriations as far as high schools are concerned. I do not believe high-school boys should be compelled to have militaristic ideas instilled into their heads while they are in a plastic stage, and when I was a member of the subcommittee of which the gentleman is now a member we were seriously considering striking out that appropriation as far as high schools are concerned.

Mr. BARBOUR. Then let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that he can introduce a bill providing for an amendment to the national defense act which will do that very thing and have it considered by his own committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. But we can do it more directly by limiting the appropriation.

Mr. BARBOUR. I want you gentlemen to get the effect of this amendment on the institutions in your sections of the country.

Mr. CLARK of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Maryland. Is the definition of compulsory military training, as mentioned here, the accepted definition by the department?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, in view of the interruptions, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARBOUR. Now, let us go to the Fifth Corps Area, and I want every gentleman present to hear how this amendment will affect the schools in the various sections of the country.

List of schools and colleges having Reserve Officers' Training Corps units

	Elective or required military training	Total enrolled	Drawing commutation		Receiving issue uniforms		Drawing neither	
			Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance
FIFTH CORPS AREA								
Senior units								
Culver Military Academy.....	Required.....	567	413	154				
Depauw University.....	Elective.....	223		61	162			
Indiana University.....	Required.....	997	911	85				1
Purdue University <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	2,049		259	1,790			
Rose Polytechnic Institute.....	do.....	239		33	206			
University of Kentucky <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	1,224		162	1,062			
Ohio State University <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	3,736	3,147	215			233	141
University of Akron.....	do.....	403		51	340			12
University of Cincinnati.....	do.....	1,148		219	871			58
University of Dayton.....	do.....	201		29	172			
Western Reserve University.....	Elective.....	110					63	47
Wilberforce University.....	Required.....	106			88	18		
West Virginia University <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	812		99	713			
Total.....		11,815	4,471	1,367	6,315	18	296	259
Junior, class M units								
Howe Military School.....	Required.....	149						148
Kentucky Military Institute.....	do.....	148						148
Greenbrier Pres. Military School.....	do.....	244						244
Total.....		541						541
Junior, class SM units								
Gary High School.....	Elective.....	209			209			
Indianapolis High Schools.....	do.....	1,410			1,410			
Louisville Male High School.....	do.....	725			725			
Owensboro High School.....	Required.....	195			195			
Western Kentucky State Teachers' College.....	Elective.....	101			101			
Total.....		2,640			2,640			
SIXTH CORPS AREA								
Senior units								
Knox College.....	Elective.....	155		34	121			
Northwestern University.....	do.....	196					117	79
University of Chicago.....	do.....	307		78	142		50	37
University of Illinois <sup>1</sup> .....	Required.....	3,577		426	3,151			
Michigan College of Mining.....	Elective.....	165	129	36				
Michigan State College <sup>1</sup> .....	Required.....	1,327		177	1,150			
University of Michigan.....	Elective.....	393	293	100				
Ripon College.....	Required.....	194		43	151			
University of Wisconsin <sup>1</sup> .....	Elective.....	624	508	111			2	3
Total.....		6,938	930	1,005	4,715		169	119
Junior, class M units								
Illinois Military School.....	Required.....	145						145
Morgan Park Military Academy.....	do.....	250			250			
Northwestern Military and Naval Academy.....	do.....	162			162			
St. John's Military Academy.....	do.....	348					348	
Western Military Academy.....	do.....	225					225	
Total.....		1,130			412		718	

<sup>1</sup> Land grant.

## List of schools and colleges having Reserve Officers' Training Corps units—Continued

	Elective or required military training	Total en- rolled	Drawing commutation		Receiving issue uniforms		Drawing neither	
			Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance
SIXTH CORPS AREA—continued								
Junior, class SM units								
Chicago High Schools.....	Elective.....	5,311			5,311			
Joliet Township High School.....	do.....	136			136			
Rockford High School.....	do.....	280			280			
Waukegan Township High School.....	Required.....	508			508			
A. D. Johnston High School.....	Elective.....	106			106			
Calumet Public High Schools.....	do.....	197			197			
Detroit High Schools.....	do.....	1,218			1,218			
Grand Rapids High Schools.....	do.....	280			280			
Beloit High Schools.....	do.....	104			104			
Campion College.....	Required.....	214			214			
Total.....		8,354			8,354			
SEVENTH CORPS AREA								
Senior units								
Onachita College.....	Required.....	116		41	74			1
University of Arkansas <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	581		85	496			
Coe College.....	do.....	271		44	227			
Iowa State College <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	1,437		145	1,217		53	22
State University of Iowa.....	do.....	1,373	1,106	103			59	105
Municipal University of Wichita.....	Elective.....	167	130	37				
Kansas State Agricultural College <sup>1</sup> .....	Required.....	1,246		82	1,133			31
University of Kansas.....	Elective.....	317	247	70				
University of Minnesota <sup>1</sup> .....	Required.....	3,393	3,060	247				91
Missouri School of Mines.....	do.....	349		47	302			
St. Louis University School of Medicine.....	do.....	497					392	105
University of Missouri <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	1,108	996	112				
Washington University.....	Elective.....	380	199	40			81	60
Creighton University.....	Required.....	485	391	26			36	32
University of Nebraska <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	1,698		143	1,555			
North Dakota Agricultural College <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	634	563	71				
University of North Dakota.....	do.....	516		71	444			1
South Dakota State College <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	530		81	449			
University of South Dakota <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	341		288	53			
Total.....		15,444	6,930	1,498	5,897		621	448
Junior, class M units								
St. Thomas Military Academy.....	Required.....	256						256
Shattuck School.....	do.....	242						242
Kemper Military School.....	do.....	336			336			
Missouri Military Academy.....	do.....	140						140
Wentworth Military Academy.....	do.....	238						238
Total.....		1,212			3,364			876
Junior, class SM units								
Council Bluffs High School.....	Required.....	559			559			
Davenport High School.....	Elective.....	326			326			
Leavenworth High School.....	Required.....	188			188			
Cretin High School.....	do.....	557			557			
Joplin High School.....	Elective.....	312			312			
Kansas City High Schools.....	do.....	1,859			1,859			
St. Joseph High Schools.....	Required.....	571			571			
South Dakota State College.....	do.....	166			66			
Total.....		4,538			4,538			
EIGHTH CORPS AREA								
Senior units								
University of Arizona <sup>1</sup> .....	Required.....	502		92	410			
Colorado Agricultural College <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	599		56	543			
Colorado School of Mines.....	Required.....	403		142	261			
New Mexico State College <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	229		45	184			
New Mexico Military Institute.....	do.....	492	414	66			12	
Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	1,508		84	1,424			
Oklahoma Military Academy.....	do.....	223			211	12		
University of Oklahoma <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	1,592		267	1,325			
Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	2,432	1,872	560				
Baylor University College of Medicine.....	Elective.....	164					109	55
Total.....		8,144	2,286	1,312	4,358	12	121	55
Junior class M units								
Allen Academy.....	Required.....	188			188			
Texas Military Institute.....	do.....	147			147			
Total.....		335			355			

<sup>1</sup> Land grant

List of school and colleges having Reserve Officers' Training Corps units—Continued

	Elective or required military training	Total enrolled	Drawing commutation		Receiving issue uniforms		Drawing neither	
			Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance
EIGHTH CORPS AREA—continued			Junior		Junior		Junior	
Junior class SM units								
Phoenix Union High School.....	Elective.....	200			200			
Canon City High School.....	Required.....	140			140			
Dallas high schools.....	Elective.....	1,576			1,576			
El Paso High School.....	do.....	259			259			
Fort Worth High School.....	do.....	465			465			
San Antonio High School.....	do.....	521			521			
Total.....		3,161			3,161			
NINTH CORPS AREA			Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance
Senior units								
Leland Stanford Junior University.....	Elective.....	362		114	248			
Pomona College.....	do.....	118		34	84			
University of California, Berkeley <sup>1</sup> .....	Required <sup>2</sup> .....	1,615		242	1,276		54	43
University of California at Los Angeles.....	do.....	1,151		138	1,013			
University of Idaho <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	623		79	544			
Montana State College <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	431		22	409			
University of Montana.....	do.....	353		22	331			
University of Nevada <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	202		12	190			
North Pacific College of Oregon.....	do.....	118					83	35
Oregon Agricultural College <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	1,259		140	1,119			
University of Oregon.....	do.....	839		55	680		67	37
Utah State Agricultural College <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	464		26	438			
University of Utah.....	Elective.....	610		90	520			
State College of Washington <sup>1</sup> .....	Required.....	1,209		76	1,133			
University of Washington.....	do.....	1,228	1,128	98			2	
University of Wyoming <sup>1</sup> .....	do.....	386		42	344			
Total.....		10,963	1,128	1,190	8,329		206	115
Junior class M units			Junior		Junior		Junior	
San Diego Army and Navy Academy.....	Required.....	225					225	
The Harvard School.....	do.....	175					175	
Total.....		400					400	
Junior class SM units								
Alameda High School.....	Elective.....	250			250			
Los Angeles High Schools.....	do.....	1,579			1,579			
Loyola High School.....	Required.....	180			180			
Oakland Public High School.....	Elective.....	1,340			1,340			
Pasadena Junior College.....	do.....	144			144			
Polytechnic High School, Long Beach.....	do.....	143			143			
Polytechnic High School and Junior College, Riverside.....	do.....	180			180			
Santa Barbara High School.....	Required.....	210			210			
San Diego High School.....	Elective.....	355			355			
San Francisco High Schools.....	do.....	1,250			1,250			
Boise High School.....	do.....	170			170			
Reno High School.....	do.....	190			190			
Ogden Senior High School.....	Required.....	370			370			
Salt Lake City High School.....	do.....	1,014			1,014			
Walla Walla High School.....	do.....	275			275			
Cheyenne High School.....	do.....	170			170			
Total.....		7,820			7,820			
HAWAIIAN DEPARTMENT			Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance
Senior unit								
University of Hawaii <sup>1</sup> .....	Required.....	348		50	298			
Junior class M units								
Kamehameha School.....	do.....	207			207			
Junior class SM units								
McKinley High School.....	do.....	807			807			
Punahou Academy.....	do.....	150			150			
Total.....		957						

<sup>1</sup> Land grant.<sup>2</sup> Except for medicine.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have just mentioned particularly the colleges, the institutions of higher learning.

This shows just what the effect of this amendment is going to be if we adopt it and put it on this bill without giving these schools and colleges a chance to consider the matter for themselves. I am not averse to any school or college changing its military course from compulsory to elective. Some of the finest institutions in this country, in my opinion, have an elective military course; but let the

schools do it themselves. They know what is best for their students better than we do, and I am not one of those persons who is scared or alarmed because of a year or two of compulsory military training.

Mr. DICKINSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. DICKINSON. The gentleman has read statistics from various schools and I would like to know the percentage of pupils taking military training where it is elec-

tive as compared with the percentage of military students where it is required.

Mr. BARBOUR. I will say to the gentleman that there is a column in the table showing the strength of the various units at the various schools and colleges.

Mr. DICKINSON. I was under the impression that wherever it is elective, you would find a much smaller percentage of the students taking military training.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. But with better results.

Mr. BARBOUR. No; not necessarily with better results.

Mr. DICKINSON. I do not know as to that.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing the whole table that I have been reading from in the Record. This will show the total enrollment and other information in regard to the units at the various schools. I think it would be enlightening if the complete table went in, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to include this as an extension of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ARENTZ). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARBOUR. I now yield to the gentleman from New York, if I have the time.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman kindly state to the committee the fact that this appropriation bill does not go into effect until July 1, 1931?

Mr. BARBOUR. That is true.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. And all of these schools, by changing from required to elective, could receive the appropriations if they could get the students to enroll.

Mr. BARBOUR. But they must change from compulsory to elective and do it by July 1 next.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. That is just the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. BARBOUR. I think the gentleman from New York and I are agreed on the facts in the matter.

Mr. GIBSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. GIBSON. The gentleman in reading the list of institutions in the First Corps Area named Norwich University.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute in order that I may answer the question of the gentleman from Vermont.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for one minute.

Mr. GIBSON. I happen to be vice president of that institution. We have been training young men there since 1819.

Mr. BARBOUR. And they have a very fine cavalry unit there.

Mr. GIBSON. I want to know how that institution would be affected under the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA].

Mr. BARBOUR. I will say to the gentleman from Vermont that you would have to change your plan of military training at Norwich University from required to elective or you would not get any money under this bill after the 1st day of July.

Mr. GIBSON. Then if a young man enters that institution he could elect whether he would take military training or not?

Mr. BARBOUR. If you change it, yes; but as it is now it is required.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the distinguished chairman yield to me for a question?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes; if I have the time.

Mr. PATTERSON. What effect would this have on the amount of money which the institutions would receive? In other words, where they have 2,000 students enrolled under the compulsory system, if they should make it elective and reduce the number of students to 500, would they get less money?

Mr. BARBOUR. The individual school would get less money, and they would not get any money unless they made it elective.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again reported.

The Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I think this amendment offered by the gentleman from New York raises a question of importance as broad and far-reaching as that of any which has been presented to this House for a long time.

The gentleman from California has read an extended list of colleges where compulsory military training is part of the program, and has frankly stated that unless between now and the 1st day of next July those colleges change what is now a compulsory military training to an elective system of training, they can not participate in any of the appropriations herein proposed to be made.

This does not leave the choice with the individual student in these colleges. There is many a boy who wants to go to the college that is near his home, accessible and available. He may not want to take military training, but he must go to this particular college and there he finds that military training is compulsory. He takes it. He is obliged to take it.

Now, do we want to commit this Congress to a policy of compulsory military training of the youth of America? This is the question you and I must answer right now on the vote on this amendment.

This Nation of ours has asked Europe to accept the Kellogg peace pact. We pose as a Nation which throws its vast influence in the scales for peace.

Are you going to permit the nations abroad when they are figuring out what they are going to do in the way of military preparation—and there is so much military preparation abroad for the next war—are you going to allow them to point their finger at us and say, "In the debate in the United States House of Representatives recently Congress committed itself to a policy of compulsory military training and forbade any institution of learning to participate in a dollar of appropriation unless they had compulsory military training"? I tell you, my friends, I want to get this thought before this House: Just as long as we are bringing our boys up in a military training, dressing them up in uniform, adding glory to all the preparations of war, breeding the psychology of war in the coming generation, we are following a course utterly inconsistent with a peace program. [Applause.]

I am not a pacifist. I believe in the national defense act. I believe in proper training of men that we may be ready in the time of emergency to act in defense of what is right and just. But I am opposed to legislation which, to say the least, encourages the appropriation of the general funds for the benefit of educational institutions which adhere to a system of compulsory military training. [Applause.]

Mr. BARBOUR. They do not have to do that.

Mr. BEEDY. What do they have to do?

Mr. BARBOUR. They do it of their own accord.

Mr. BEEDY. When will they have a greater opportunity to make a change than they will have before the 1st of next July?

Mr. BARBOUR. Give them a reasonable chance. Why does not the gentleman go to these institutions in the State of Maine, for instance, and tell them what you have told us here and let them decide the question for themselves?

Mr. BEEDY. I am not dictating to any institution of learning. But if you gentlemen are going to vote against the pending amendment, how are you going to escape the charge that you favor compulsory military training?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARBOUR. Now, if the gentleman will yield, let me take two institutions. There is the University of Maine, which requires military training. There is Yale University in the State of Connecticut that has an elective course in military training. They both benefit by this appropriation and each university determines for itself what its course shall be. Maine University has the compulsory training and Yale University chooses the elective. Is there any reason why Maine can not change from compulsory to elective if it should so decide? They know very well that they can.

That is the way it should be, and we should not dictate to the University of Maine that it should change its policy in regard to military training.

Mr. BEEDY. That sounds all right as far as it goes.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEEDY. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. The gentleman from California knows that in his own State an institution undertook to make the military course elective, and that the War Department withdrew the funds from the institution.

Mr. BARBOUR. I do not know that.

Mr. BEEDY. That is an important statement. Is the gentleman prepared to back up that statement that when once an institution of learning changes from compulsory military training to elective, the War Department says that it can not have any of this money?

Mr. COLLINS. That was the testimony before the Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. BARBOUR. Oh, there are dozens of schools that are elective and are getting the money. I know nothing of the facts about this institution that the gentleman from Mississippi talks about.

Mr. COLLINS. The gentleman heard the same testimony that I did.

Mr. BARBOUR. But it was not verified. It was the statement of a man proposing this amendment before our committee.

Mr. COLLINS. It was not disputed. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. BARBOUR. It does not have to be disputed. If it is true, it never made a ripple in my State.

Mr. BEEDY. Let me ask the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR] a question. Does he think the pending amendment has any significance or effect?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. BEEDY. What is it?

Mr. BARBOUR. Take the gentleman's own University of Maine. Unless the University of Maine changes its course from compulsory to elective between now and the 1st of July, it will get no money whatever under this bill, no help from the Army in the way of officers, no contribution to the advanced students such as is given to the institution at this time. There may be time for the University of Maine to change its policy between now and the 1st of July, but rather than our forcing the University of Maine to change its policy, let it have the right to change its own policy, let it pass upon this question without our undertaking to determine its policy and forcing its hand.

Mr. BEEDY. I can not see why that is not a 2-edged sword. If you vote against this amendment I can not see why we are not making it needless for that institution to change its policy. It does seem to me when the welfare of mankind hangs in the balance, and we are setting an example for future generations, that we ought to be very careful lest any action taken here be justly construed as one favoring the compulsory training of our youth for future wars. [Applause.]

Mr. BARBOUR. I say to you gentlemen that in this bill we are seeking to carry out the provisions of the national defense act. Congress has determined this policy, not this committee.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. But this is Congress.

Mr. BARBOUR. That has been the policy for years. If you want to change this policy, if you think that the Reserve Officers' Training Corps organizations in the schools and colleges make us a militaristic nation, then amend the national defense act and change that.

Mr. BEEDY. Is the gentleman himself in favor of compulsory military training?

Mr. BARBOUR. No; but that question does not enter into it at all.

Mr. BEEDY. Oh, but it does.

Mr. BARBOUR. It does only so far as the individual institution is concerned, but not as a national policy.

Mr. BEEDY. Is the gentleman in favor of this Congress taking any action which could be construed as supporting compulsory military training in our schools and colleges?

Mr. BARBOUR. I am in favor of maintaining the situation just as it is at the present time and letting the schools determine their own policies.

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am not one who is opposed to preparedness. [Applause.]

Mr. BEEDY. Nor am I.

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. But I am certainly in favor of this amendment, and I shall tell you why. I happen to be a member of the Board of Education of the City and County of Philadelphia, that has enrolled about 34,000 high-school students. I happen to be secretary and treasurer of a great university in the city of Philadelphia that has an enrolled membership of about 14,000 students. I am going to speak from the standpoint, first, of the educator on this question of compulsory military training in our schools and colleges. In both the institutions or organizations that I am connected with it is optional, but those of us who have committed to our care the education of the youth of America are at our wits' ends to know how to deal with the various problems that confront us on which we must educate the children and to decide how to discard those subjects that we consider not important enough to embody in our curriculum. There is not an educator of consequence in the United States—and I think I can say this without fear of contradiction—who would not say that he is unalterably opposed to military training being compulsory in our schools and colleges. [Applause.] I am not speaking as a layman, but I am speaking as a man who has devoted 20 years of his life to education in the great city of Philadelphia, and I know exactly how educators in other parts of the United States view this problem. When you introduce compulsory military training in the schools and colleges, or permit it or require it in order that the school may receive a Federal appropriation, you are disorganizing the whole machinery of the educational part of the institution's work, and I am one who believes that the education of America to-day should be democratic, that we should not teach military science in our free citizenship institutions. [Applause.] If we are going to teach military training, let us confine it to the military colleges and to the student training camps.

For those organizations I will vote for every dollar that the War Department needs, but I plead with you in the interest of higher education not to permit the military-training course to be forced upon us. The men and women who are in charge of these institutions, on account of the multitudinous things we are asked to teach the youth, must discriminate and discard the things that are not essential to real education. Do not require us, in order to get an appropriation for our military corps, to make it compulsory on our students. So much for the educational side of it.

I introduced a bill to the same effect as this amendment four years ago, and exhaustive hearings were held before the Committee on Military Affairs. It was testified in those hearings that there were over 300 high schools and colleges in the United States requiring military training.

Those of us who were in the training camps in 1917 know that as far as military value is concerned that kind of military training does not amount to anything. Am I right or

wrong? [Applause.] It does not amount to anything. I can take a company of 190 men and in five weeks' intensive training in any camp give them more instruction than they will ever get in the military course of any of our schools or colleges in three or four years. The training is of little military value. The real purpose back of this is psychological. It is desired to create in the minds of the youth of America the military viewpoint. It is not for the military science they are going to learn, but it is the military psychology that they want to instill in the minds of the American youth. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, so much for the purely educational feature of this question.

Now, I want to pass to something that is far above the educational feature, and that is the spiritual note that is struck when this question is discussed.

I am not one who is so materialistic and who depends so much upon the strong arm of might that I can not recognize that there is a superior force known as the great spiritual law of life and the spiritual nature of man. Anything which pollutes the mind of youth and drives him from the high plane of the spiritual outlook upon his relationship with his fellow man at home and abroad sets aside that supreme law that should govern humanity. [Applause.]

I want to strike that spiritual note to-day by reading to you something that has been said on this question by those who have authority to speak on that higher plane. They are the Disciples' Convention, Memphis, Tenn., 1926; the Northern Baptist Convention, June, 1926; the National Council of the Congregational Churches of the United States, Omaha, 1927; General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States of America, 1928; Presbyterian General Assembly, 1926; Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, 1926; General Synod of the Reformed Church of America, 1930; Western Unitarian Conference, Cincinnati, 1930; Society for the Advancement of Judaism, March, 1926; Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, 1926; National Council of Student Young Men's Christian Association, 1926; International Convention of Disciples of Christ, 1930; Central Conference of Jewish Rabbis, 1928; World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches, adopted at the annual meeting at St. Louis, 1927, readopted at the annual meeting in New York, 1928; National Study Conference on the Churches and World Peace, February, 1930.

Then come the great educational bodies: The American Physical Education Association; the National Education Association, department of superintendence; representatives of the educational institutions throughout the length and breadth of the land.

The World Federation of Educational Associations, in August, 1929; American Federation of Teachers, in 1929; the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, June, 1920; National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Association; Camp Fire Girls; the American Federation of Labor.

Representatives of the American Federation of Labor came before that committee and said that in the convention in Atlantic City, where there were over 600 delegates present, a resolution was unanimously adopted recommending the support of legislation to prohibit compulsory military training in the schools and colleges.

The Farmer-Labor Party; the National Grange, Seattle, November, 1929; the New York State Federation of Labor in 1929; the National Farmers' Union Convention, Denver, Colo.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. Here is the National Council of Jewish Women, the Federation of Women's Board of Foreign Missions of North America.

Is there any list that could be compiled of organizations better fitted to speak for the soul of America than the list I have named there?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. If they can not speak for the soul of America, for the aspiration of our people, then there is no organization of human beings who can so speak. I am not ashamed to raise my voice, both as an educator and as one who tries to be a Christian, against any compulsory military training in the schools and colleges. [Applause.] I say that notwithstanding the fact that I am a member of a religious faith opposed to war. And yet, if war were to break out to-morrow I would consider it my duty to raise my hand in the national defense. I will never withhold my voice or my vote on any appropriation that these United States will need for the purpose of our national security, but when it comes to pollution of the minds of the youth, when it comes to destroying the efforts of the Christian people of this country to raise our young people to something higher and better than that which has gone before, I say the time has now come to try to obtain a declaration on the part of this House which will be declaratory of that for which we stand. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks by inserting these resolutions in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ON MILITARY TRAINING SHOWING THE ATTITUDES OF VARIOUS BODIES AS OFFICIALLY EXPRESSED IN RESOLUTIONS  
THE ATTITUDES OF ORGANIZED RELIGIOUS BODIES

*Disciples' Convention, Memphis, November 11-17, 1926*

Whereas our people are committed to the principle of no conscription in times of peace: Be it

*Resolved*, (1) That we oppose all compulsory military training in the colleges, universities, and high schools of this country; (2) that we congratulate the colleges of the Disciples of Christ on the absence of all military training on their campuses.

*Northern Baptist Convention, June, 1926*

*Resolved*, That we once more express our conviction that war is contrary to the spirit and teachings of Jesus; that we are opposed to war as a method of settlement of international disputes; and that we declare our irrevocable determination to substitute the arbitrament of law, reason, and conciliation for that of slaughter; and we rejoice in every effort put forth in the interests of a just peace; that we urge all men to ally themselves with efforts for the peaceable settlement of national disputes; and that we look with disfavor upon compulsory military training in our colleges and high schools.

*National Council of the Congregational Churches of the United States, Omaha, Nebr., May 25-June 1, 1927*

By a vote of 200 to 20, the national council adopted the following resolution against compulsory military training in public schools and colleges:

Whereas compulsory military training in our schools and colleges fosters a general attitude of mind conducive to militarism and sole reliance on force and gives ground for other nations to question the peaceful purposes of the United States: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the National Council of the Congregational Churches, assembled in Omaha, condemns both in theory and practice any compulsory military training in public schools or in tax-supported or land-grant institutions of higher learning; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we urge congressional action to release all instructors in optional courses in military science from the direct control of the War Department to the regularly constituted local academic authorities, thus effectually freeing our educational system from the control or influence of the War Department.

*General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America, Kansas City, Mo., May, 1928, passed the following resolution by a vote of 800 to 50*

We are opposed to all military training in high schools and to compulsory military training in colleges and universities.

*Presbyterian General Assembly, June, 1926*

We also put ourselves on record as opposed to all militarism in spirit and in propaganda. We favor such voluntary drill and training as may seem wise to students and their parents for pur-

poses of precision, obedience, and team work, but we are opposed to forcing students in high schools, colleges, and universities to any form of military organization or exercise.

*Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, Walton, N. Y., June, 1926*

This synod declares its opposition to compulsory military training in high schools, colleges, and universities of the United States as unnecessary and conducive only to a militaristic spirit in the coming generation.

*General Synod of the Reformed Church in America, June, 1930*

We urge the people of our churches to stand with the educators against the programs of enlarged and popularized military training in schools and colleges, and to advocate a more effective constructive program for citizenship through educational processes.

*Western Unitarian Conference, Cincinnati, May, 1930*

Whereas the United States, through the Kellogg peace pact, now a part of the highest law of the land, has renounced war as an instrument of national policy, and has taken active steps toward the reduction of arms: Be it

*Resolved*, That we, the members of this Western Unitarian Conference, express our hearty sympathy with the 2,000 men students at the University of Iowa who have petitioned that military training in the university be put on a voluntary basis, and have appealed to the general public for support: And be it further

*Resolved*, That we express our opposition to military training in our high schools and to compulsory military training in either high school or college.

*Society for the Advancement of Judaism, March, 1926*

The Society for the Advancement of Judaism has followed with great interest your campaign against compulsory military training in the colleges. The members of the society want to go on record as indorsing unanimously your stand and your views on militarism in the civilian schools and colleges. It believes with you that the only road to peace is to create a mind set for peace by stressing and spreading the peace psychology. It can see in compulsory military training an insidious method of nurturing and fostering an urge for national self-expression through war and conquest.

*Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, May, 1926*

1. That systematic and technical military training for youth of high-school age is to be deplored as foreign to the aims and ideals of our educational system.

2. That civilian educational institutions should not make military training a required subject.

3. That churches and educational leaders give careful study to the whole question of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps in the school and college.

*National Council of Student Young Men's Christian Association, 1926*

*Resolved*, That we, the members of the 1926 National Council of Student Young Men's Christian Association, do hereby register our emphatic protest against compulsory military training—in other than technically military schools—as one of these agencies of militarism in our schools, colleges, and universities.

*International Convention of the Disciples of Christ, October, 1930*

We deplore the expansion of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps in high schools and colleges of our country, and particularly its compulsory features. We agree with educators of high authority that if the course of instruction given is military training, it ought not to be given to pupils of high-school age; if it is not military training, it ought not to be a War Department expenditure.

*Central Conference of Jewish Rabbis, 1928*

We reaffirm our opposition to the militarization of our schools and colleges by compulsory military training.

*World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches. Adopted at the annual meeting, St. Louis, 1927. Readopted at the annual meeting, New York, 1928*

Without raising the question of the expediency of maintaining an adequate military and naval defense so long as the war system lasts, we deplore any tendencies which put undue emphasis on militarism in education. In particular, we oppose military training in all public and high schools and all compulsory military training in colleges and universities, except in institutions established for the specific purpose of military education.

*National Study Conference on the Churches and World Peace, February, 1930—Military training*

1. We agree with former Secretary of State Kellogg that "the most certain insurance" against war "is the training of the thoughts of men in the way of peace," and we deplore the present Federal expenditure for military training in high schools, civil colleges, and summer camps—an expenditure which is greater than the total operating costs of the Department of State.

2. Accepting the expert opinion of the World Federation of Education Associations, the National Education Association, and other competent bodies that military training is not the best form of training for developing physique, citizenship, and patriotism, we urge that the citizens' military training camps should be reorganized and renamed without the military element, but with emphasis upon physical development and nonmilitary ways of national service, such as projects of reclamation and conservation of natural resources, and that the control of these camps and expenditures for the same should be lodged in the Depart-

ment of the Interior or some other civilian agency, and not in the Department of War.

3. With regard to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, we call the attention of the churches to the particular dangers of military compulsion, military propaganda, and military money inhering in War Department control of this military education in civil universities and schools. We urge the churches throughout the country to gather fact material in local communities and States and study intensively the psychological effects of military courses, especially their effect on the attitudes of students toward such questions as preparedness, the World Court, 100 per cent nationalism, freedom of speech and discussion, etc. We also urge that wherever compulsory military training exists our churches shall spread the facts concerning it so as to facilitate speedy abolition of the same. We recommend cooperation with the committee on militarism in education, Bible House, Astor Place, New York, and other peace agencies studying this subject. Especially in high schools and church schools and colleges we believe that military training is out of place and that there should be no compulsory military courses in any civil institution of higher learning. To this extent, at least, the national defense act should be revised and amended so that our Government, which has signed the pact of Paris renouncing war as an instrument of national policy, will no longer aid in coercing schoolboys to prepare for battle.

#### THE ATTITUDES OF EDUCATIONAL BODIES

The American Physical Education Association, at an annual convention during the war, at which "preparedness" was the leading topic, resolved:

That military drill in the public schools does not develop the necessary qualities in youth which prepare a nation for the struggles of war, to say nothing of those of peace, because—

(a) It is not only very limited in its activities but actually harmful in its effects on boys less than 18 or 20 years of age, as has been so clearly demonstrated by Sir William Aitkin, professor of pathology in the Army Medical School of England.

(b) It can not teach the boys the real art of war, since they are too young to handle the real weapons and undergo the rigors of adequate instruction.

(c) It fosters a false sense of patriotism which does not appreciate the seriousness of war or the glories of peace.

(d) Constant drill in a hall or on an athletic field is artificial, monotonous, and wearisome, tending to produce an aversion for military training instead of an interest in the real problems of a soldier.

4. That a rational system of physical training, consisting of exercises and games adapted to the age, sex, and capacity of the growing boy and girl, as well as instruction in hygiene, sanitation, and first aid, is of the greatest value in preparing the youth of the country for the struggles of war and of peace. \* \* \*

The National Education Association, department of superintendence, after careful study of the values of military training in the schools, resolved during the war:

\* \* \* It is often claimed that military exercises, whether we call them military training or military drill, offer the best method of training pupils in obedience, promptness, truthfulness, industry, and other desirable personal traits; in short, of developing personal character and of training pupils physically. Those engaged in the work of education are practically unanimous in asserting that these claims have no justification.

\* \* \* The ideals of the kind of obedience and of general conduct aimed at by military exercises are best represented by the word "martinet," which these exercises long ago contributed to our educational vocabulary—ideals which every teacher who aims at real character development seeks to avoid.

Those who favor military drill maintain that it is the most effective means of developing patriotic feeling. If this theory were well founded, we should all be eager to adopt it, for, as teachers of the young, we acknowledge the responsibility which regard for the patriotic citizenship of our children places upon us, and agree that we must be unceasing in our efforts to plant the virtue of patriotism in their hearts. But if we look beneath the surface, we find that military patriotism may be no deeper and no more lasting than military obedience. We must not confuse excitement with patriotism, the showy exhibition with real love of country. \* \* \*

But we go further. We must teach our pupils to make the passage from love of country to love of mankind, love of humanity, a transition which civilization teaches us to make, but which the spirit of military drill can not make, but rather tends to prevent.

*The World Federation of Education Associations, August, 1929*

*Resolved*, (1) That an endeavor be made to secure that systematic military training shall not be given in civil education institutions, but where such institutions undertake military training it shall in no case be a compulsory subject of the curriculum.

(2) That every endeavor be made to secure the substitution of physical training, of exercise, and of sports for the military training too often now given in civil education institutions and so to insure adequate training in character and citizenship and thus to lead the youth of the world to a better and wider appreciation of the real meaning of patriotism and the duties of citizenship.

*American Federation of Teachers, 1929*

Whereas efforts are being made by the War Department to establish Reserve Officers' Training Corps units in the public high schools of the country; and

Whereas in these efforts to attract young men to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, the War Department uses pretty girls, credits, uniforms, saddle horses, etc., as bait; and

Whereas the establishment of Reserve Officers' Training Corps units in the high schools will put the public school system of the country under the control of the War Department, create a war mind set with a psychological situation favorable to war or its outbreak; and

Whereas the training received in the units is a very inadequate substitute for physical training or training in citizenship since the Reserve Officers' Training Corps training stresses unquestioned obedience, whereas training for citizenship depends for its effectiveness on the development of a critical and questioning attitude; therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the American Federation of Teachers oppose not only the establishment of Reserve Officers' Training Corps units in our high schools but also any attempt to militarize the mind of America.

*American Federation of Teachers, 1930*

Whereas compulsory military training is inconsistent with the spirit of democratic education, and

Whereas the Attorney General of the United States has interpreted the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862 as requiring only that military training be offered by the State institutions which come under its provisions, not that such training be compulsory on every male student, and

Whereas the State legislature of Wisconsin in 1923 explicitly removed the compulsory feature from its statute regulating military training in the university of that State, and

Whereas there are 86 colleges and universities in the United States where military training is compulsory for at least two years, many of which come under the Morrill Act, be it

*Resolved*, That the American Federation of Teachers urge its members to cooperate with those groups in their own States which are working through universities and legislatures to remove the compulsory provision wherever found.

*National Congress of Parents and Teachers, June, 1920*

The National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Associations places itself on record as opposed to compulsory military training and service. \* \* \*

\* \* \* We urge the passage of the bill for universal physical education as part of the school system, thereby giving equal opportunity to girls and boys for physical development and making unnecessary the effort for compulsory military training.

*National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Associations, 1923*

Whereas the Department of War has frankly avowed its purpose of entering our schools in order to secure a larger number of summer military camps and has already launched this program: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Associations protest this attempt to foster the military spirit.

*Camp Fire Girls, Executive and Guardians Association, January, 1922*

Whereas the camp-fire idea does not harmonize with the formality of military drills and terms; and

Whereas it has been proved in camps of Camp Fire Girls that better response to the Camp Fire program is gained by substituting the organized hike and the organized game for formal drill and by using the usual terms of everyday life to express leadership in place of military terminology: Be it

*Resolved*, That all guardians, executives, and directors of Camp Fire Girls discourage the use of anything military in their group or camp organization.

*ATTITUDES OF LABOR AND FARMER GROUPS*

*American Federation of Labor, 1927*

The committee recommends continued support of proposed legislation to prohibit compulsory military training in any educational institution.

*Illinois State Federation of Labor, Herrin, Ill., November, 1928*

*Resolved*, That while the Illinois Federation of Labor is not opposed to providing military instruction in the university for those college students who wish it, it does oppose making this training obligatory upon those who do not wish to take such training. It therefore instructs its officers to work for the removal of the compulsory feature and for the substitution of adequate physical training and instruction in citizenship for those students who do not elect the military work.

*Farmer-Labor Party, July, 1923*

Whereas there is an extensive, heavily financed, and steadily increasing propaganda in this country, directed by the War Department, to militarize the United States by standardizing the children in the schools, by shrewd methods inducing and in some cases even compelling the youth of the land into entering military organizations, and by wholesale attack upon citizens' organizations working in the interests of peace; therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we offset the attempt to militarize the minds of our children by demanding the teaching of the truth about the causes, results, and character of war, and the teaching of the history of the efforts of men to achieve world peace, in our schools, and the elimination of material tending to the glorification of war and the perpetuation of hereditary hatreds from our textbooks.

*The National Grange, Seattle, November, 1929*

Whereas the teaching of military training in our high schools, colleges, and universities is not in keeping with the spirit that actuates the almost universal effort to secure world-wide peace; therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we favor the elimination of military training from high schools and the compulsory feature from colleges and universities.

*National Farmers' Union Convention, Denver, Colo., November 23, 1928*

1. We are in favor of every move toward the abolition of war as a means of settlement of differences between nations. We therefore urge the ratification of the Kellogg treaties, the lessening of emphasis of military training in high schools and colleges, and the complete abandonment of the principle of compulsory military training in any public school. We would point out in this connection in the case of land and agricultural colleges the distinction between the compulsory offering of a military course and the compulsory participation in such a course on the part of the student body.

*ATTITUDES OF WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS*

*National Council of Jewish Women, 1926*

Whereas compulsory military training in schools and colleges of the United States has greatly increased since the World War; and Whereas such training stresses war psychology in the minds of our youth; and

Whereas the War Department is thus given unprecedented influence in our civil educational institutions; and

Whereas such training runs counter to the movement to substitute law for war: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we, the National Council of Jewish Women, in triennial assembled, do earnestly urge that the compulsory feature of such training be eliminated in land-grant colleges.

*National Council of Jewish Women, 1929*

Whereas military training in secondary schools of the United States has greatly increased since the World War; and

Whereas such training tends to stress war psychology in the minds of our adolescents; and

Whereas the War Department is given unprecedented influence in our civil educational institutions; and

Whereas such training runs counter to the movement to substitute law for war: Be it

*Resolved*, That we adopt the recommendation that the further introduction of such training be eliminated in the secondary schools.

*Federation of Women's Board of Foreign Missions of North America convention, Atlantic City, N. J., January 9-12, 1926*

Permanent world peace can never be achieved until the children of the world are trained to believe in it and strive for it \* \* \* We therefore recommend that this organization protest against the militarization of youth in our church and schools, and by every means assist in raising a generation around the world which will "learn war no more," but will learn realization of justice, love, and mutual respect as a basis for a new world order.

*National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, Cleveland, Ohio, January, 1927*

\* \* \* The Sisterhoods' recommendation is that the compulsory feature of military training be eliminated in all land-grant colleges.

*National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, November, 1922*

We urge the continued cooperation of the United States in world affairs, responsible membership in effective world organization for peace, outlawry of war by international law, and world reduction of armaments to police force. We oppose military training in our schools.

*ATTITUDES OF LABOR AND FARMER GROUPS*

*New York State Federation of Labor, 1929*

Whereas (the New York State Federation of Labor) feels that the established institutions for military training by the War Department, both State and National, are sufficient for the training of citizens for defensive purposes without the introduction of military training into the public schools \* \* \* (we) are opposed to establishing of the units of the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps in any branch of the public-school system.

*National Women's Trade Union League, 1926 and 1929*

The committee desires to emphasize the importance of peace, working among children and young people through the schools, and protests against compulsory military training in our public schools and colleges.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is not a question of compulsory military training. This is a question of whether the Congress of the United States is going to attempt to run the business of every school and college in the land, or whether we are going to leave it to the boards of trustees of those schools and colleges.

Under the national defense act this training is provided for those schools which elect it and in such manner as the boards of trustees and school commissioners of the different towns decide it should be run. Do you suppose for a

minute that if there was any substantial objection in any school or college to military training that any board of trustees would permit it to go on? Do you suppose that if that objection existed in the city of Washington, in the city of Philadelphia, or in any other city in the land, the board of education of such city would permit compulsory military training to go on?

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Within the last 10 minutes my attention has been called to the fact that at the University of Minnesota eight years ago the student body signed a petition to the extent of 4,000 protesting against this training, and the authorities of that institution dismissed from its rolls hundreds of those students because they would not conform to the requirements.

Mr. TABER. And we should not attempt to tell the University of Minnesota how to run its business. That is ridiculous. A statement was made in the hearings before the Military Appropriations Committee by the secretary of one of these pacifist organizations, one of these organizations which exist for the purpose of maintaining a paid secretary. He told us that the California Institute of Technology applied to the War Department and they found that they would not get the service unless they continued to have it compulsory. You turn to the list of those institutions that are receiving this service and you do not find that institution anywhere on the list.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. The California Institute of Technology does not appear on this list at all?

Mr. TABER. Not at all, which bears out the fact that that institution never had this service. It is the most ridiculous thing for us to attempt to tell every institution in the land how they shall run their business. [Applause.] The worst thing you can do for education is to take it away from the parents and guardians of the children and take it into the Congress of the United States and take it away from the trustees of the universities throughout the land and attempt to handle the proposition from Washington.

It seems to me this amendment should be defeated and that the law should be allowed to go on so that the youth of the land may be permitted to continue this training in an orderly way, under the direction of those who run the schools. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen of the committee, I do not believe anybody would accuse me of being a pacifist. If I may be open to any accusation it is being for too much national defense. Therefore to-day I rise, not as a pacifist but as an American citizen and Member of Congress, to favor the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA]. [Applause.]

I have listened to this debate and some very interesting facts have been brought out, but there are a few things which I think should be cleared up. For instance, the chairman in reading a list of these different institutions gave the impression that a school like Norwich University in the State of Vermont, which is a military school, would not come under Mr. LA GUARDIA's amendment. Mr. LA GUARDIA's amendment provides that any school which is a recognized military school of the United States shall be excluded from his amendment.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. Is Norwich University a military school?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes; it is. The students wear uniforms and it is one of the best military schools in the country.

Mr. BARBOUR. The vice president of the university is present and maybe he can tell us.

Mr. GIBSON. It is strictly a military school.

Mr. CONNERY. Yes; it is strictly a military school. Also I would like to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to this fact, which is a little personal affair which happened to me just before Christmas. I am not in favor of compulsory military training except in time of war.

I believe every instinct of the American people is against compulsory military training [applause], and I am not talking as a pacifist.

I went down to see the Secretary of War last week with Father MacDonald, of the city of Lawrence, who has a corps of cadets up there called St. Mary's Cadets. It is not a military school and is purely a voluntary affair. These boys, 800 of them, come in and drill two nights or three nights a week, and in the World War they had 95 per cent voluntary enlistment in the service of the United States. [Applause.] We went to the Secretary of War in an endeavor on the part of Father MacDonald to purchase—not to get them free—but to purchase enough uniforms for these boys, and we found that under the present law he could not buy them. He could not get obsolete uniforms, he could not get surplus uniforms for these boys who are purely patriotic and unselfish in the service of their country, because there would have to be an auction and some clothing dealer in the army and navy stores could buy \$150,000 worth, but of course Father MacDonald with his group of 800 boys could not afford to come in and buy \$150,000 worth of uniforms in order to outfit 800 boys.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BARBOUR. I am in sympathy with the gentleman, but this amendment would not alter that situation. We would have to change the law itself.

Mr. CONNERY. I understand that, but I am stating that if the committee would take care of the boys of the United States who are willing, not by compulsion but voluntarily, to give their services to the United States, by at least giving them uniforms so they may be able to parade and drill, we would get better results than by compulsory military training.

Mr. BARBOUR. The gentleman would have to change the authorizing act in order to do that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The Committee on Appropriations could not do that.

Mr. BARBOUR. I am in sympathy with the proposition of the gentleman and would like to see that done.

Mr. CONNERY. I am calling this to the attention of the gentleman in contradistinction to the requirement of compulsory military training.

Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELSH] stated it very tritely and expertly when he stated that the high school and the military college training of the men in the World War did not mean a thing as far as military training is concerned, and even the members of your Regular Army and National Guard, when they got in the trenches had to be "untaught" a number of things they had learned. It was an entirely new type of warfare to them because you did not have hand grenades in the early wars. You did not have 1-pounders or gas masks in the Spanish-American War, or a thousand and one other things that were used in the World War.

Now, take the case of a boy 14 or 15 years old who has tuberculosis. You may send him to the University of Maine, or any other school with compulsory military training. He goes to the University of Maine, not because he wants to be a soldier, but because he wants to learn Latin or Greek or engineering, or whatever subject he is interested in.

After you put him there he may be taken out on an 18-mile hike when any doctor in the world will tell you that you should not take a man who is afflicted with TB or who is not physically able to go on hikes, and make him hike for 18 miles, and yet they do it with these men. I know they do it, Mr. Chairman. What they should do with these men is to put them in a gymnasium and let them use the dumb-bells or let them use the pulleys or the punching bag or something moderate that is suitable to men in that condition, and not compulsory drilling or hikes.

Mr. BARBOUR and Mr. MAAS rose.

Mr. CONNERY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BARBOUR. With respect to the incident the gentleman has just referred to, the national defense act speci-

cally states that this training shall be given to young men who are physically fit.

Mr. CONNERY. That is what the act may state, but practically what happens is that whether it is in a high school or in a college, when they call out the battalion for drill, you go, and if you do not go they say, "Oh, you are yellow."

Mr. BARBOUR. But the gentleman will admit that those who are not physically fit do not have to take such training. I know that is true of all of these institutions.

Mr. CONNERY. Theoretically yes; practically no. It is like it was in the Army, where you were supposed to be always well, and if you went on sick report some hard-boiled officer would say that you were yellow. You might be almost dead but that did not matter.

Mr. MAAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. MAAS. Can the gentleman cite a specific case where they even permit them to take such drills if they are not physically fit? As a matter of fact, they are not allowed to take it if they are not physically fit.

Mr. CONNERY. I have not had that experience. If the gentleman has had that experience, then his experience is different from mine.

Mr. MAAS. I will ask the gentleman to cite a single case where anybody who was unfit had to submit to military training.

Mr. CONNERY. Does the gentleman want me to get statistics and give him the names of the boys who were not physically fit who were called out for drill and the institutions that they attended?

Mr. MAAS. It is not of much value to Congress unless the gentleman can do that.

Mr. CONNERY. Does the gentleman want me to give a list of such boys who were made to drill every day in the high schools when they were not physically fit?

Mr. MAAS. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. Very well; I will give the gentleman a list of the names and addresses of the boys who were taken out on hikes when they were not physically fit.

I do not believe that the American people want compulsory training. When it comes time to go to war, I believe the American people are in favor of the draft to take them, rich and poor, regardless of where they come from.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two more minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I will not take any further time except to say that I am in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from New York and I do not agree with some of the remarks that have been made quoting certain pacifist organizations in favor of this amendment. I am not a pacifist. I have no sympathy with pacifist doctrines. I have fought for national defense every minute since I have been a Member of this House during the past eight years.

From my point of view this is not a pacifist proposition. It is a question of whether a boy up in the State of Maine, for instance, wants to go to the University of Maine and get an education and will be compelled to go to school in New Hampshire, Vermont, or Massachusetts unless he agrees to take compulsory training or whether he will be a free-born American citizen, to receive his education where he wants to get it, ready and willing, if necessary, in time of war to take up arms in the defense of his country. [Applause.]

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS. I suggest that the gentleman make it 30 minutes.

Mr. BARBOUR. Very well, I will accept that.

Mr. COLLINS. And out of that I want 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ARENTZ). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I understood the motion of the gentleman from California that the time be equally divided between those for and against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not so understand, but the Chair will recognize those for and against.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I think the question before the House is not a question of compulsory training at all, but is a question whether you are going to have Congress run these institutions. Compulsory military training is no different than the requirement to learn a foreign language. It might be objectionable to some Members of the House that these boys should learn a foreign language. Would you withhold an appropriation for the school because they did not like that course?

Now, the situation at the University of Minnesota has been misrepresented. However, it does not make any difference whether every student signed the petition; are we going to have the colleges or schools run by students or by the boards of trustees? Besides, there never were three or four hundred students dismissed because they refused to take the compulsory military training.

Mr. HUDSON. Is that school for the students or is it for the faculty?

Mr. MAAS. Do you want the soviet or communistic element to run this college? Would you set up soviets of students to dictate the courses they should take? And how about the insane asylums—who are they for? [Laughter.] Do you want the inmates to run them? [Laughter.]

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman consider that analogous?

Mr. HUDSON. The gentleman ought to know the difference between an insane asylum and a university.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I insist that the Chair protect the gentleman from Minnesota. [Laughter.]

Mr. MAAS. Thanks, but I do not need protection. [Laughter.] I know that I will be called a militarist because I am opposing this amendment, but that does not bother me. That is always the way with these pacifists; if anyone opposes their proposition, then they are militarists. How many of these men went through the last war? Some did. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] did. But most of them know nothing of the actual problem of training. We had a horrible loss, a terrific loss, of human life because we were not prepared. These men who went through the war are asking for adequate defense. Everybody else was prepared, and that was why we suffered that great loss of human life. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELSH] says that there is no benefit and no value in this military training. That is not true. Our best officers and noncommissioned officers came from the schools where we had military training. They say that the whole theory of our position seems to be that these schools where they have military training is an insidious device to bring up students as militarists. That is a lot of bunk and you gentlemen know it. I defy you to mention a single instance where they have taught militarism or inculcated a military spirit.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Germany went through intensive military training, and where is she now?

Mr. MAAS. And so did every other nation in the world except the United States, and we had the most horrible loss of life of any of them.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Oh, no.

Mr. MAAS. The gentleman says that being trained did not keep Germany out of war. Our being unprepared did not keep us out of the war.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. No; but it put Germany into it, and us also.

Mr. MAAS. One more thought I want to get before this House. I have been making an independent study in the last year or so, and I want the Members of this House to know that the delinquency records of the country show a most surprising condition with respect to boys who have had military training. The number of boys who have had military training who get into difficulty with the law and with police officers is about one-fifth of those who have not had military training and who do get into such difficulties. [Applause.]

We are in the position, on the one hand, of saying to the schools that we want these boys given military training, and "here is the money to train them with," but on the other hand, of saying that "if you compel them to take the training, you can not have the money to train them." The military side of this training is, however, the smallest part of the benefit. It is the benefit to the boys of systematic, regular exercise, discipline, inculcating habits of neatness, orderliness, courtesy, and the democratic ideals of common service, where all men of given rank are treated equally, regardless of family name, wealth, or social position, that really counts. The uniform becomes the democratizing agent and quickly eliminates snobbishness. A large part of these so-called military courses in our schools is devoted to instilling, not a desire for war, but a deep, abiding peace-time citizenship of the finest kind.

It is not militarism to teach the youth of the country to be prepared to defend their country if the need should arise. That is what is taught and that is all that is taught of a military nature. There is never even the hint of training for any other purpose. If it is a crime to be taught that it is right to defend your country, then thank God there are a lot of us yet who are willing to be such criminals. But a pretty state of affairs has come to pass if it is a crime to teach patriotism. If we are, however, to teach that it is right and decent and proper to defend one's country when defense is needed, then we must provide the means of teaching the youth how to defend it if their services ever become necessary. It is getting now so that one must blush to even mention patriotism.

In most States there are laws requiring boys and girls up to certain ages to go to school. Most of the subjects are specified, and yet there is no protest about compelling these students to take some course that they may not want to take. The principle is the same. Congress would not think of interfering with an individual State and say that the State had no right to compel its youth to go to school if the schools in that State required instruction in American history, let us say. Who among you would stand for Congress fixing the speed laws within the various States on any Federal-aid highway, just because Congress contributed a part of the money to build the highways?

What right has Congress to tell the Legislature of Minnesota what it shall or shall not require to be taught at the University of Minnesota? I deny that Congress has any such right. It is a matter for the people of Minnesota to decide. We elect our legislature, and if we do not want compulsory military training in our schools in Minnesota, we, the people of Minnesota, have the remedy in our hands. Our legislature will act in that matter for us, not this Congress. What right has a Congressman from Mississippi, or Michigan, or New York, to say what we in Minnesota shall permit at our educational institutions, any more than he would have to say what our traffic or speed laws are to be on our highways in Minnesota? This is not a matter of militarism; it is a matter of permitting the States to govern their own institutions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman and gentleman of the committee, I want you to think what will be the effect within our own States. I am opposed to compulsory military training as much as anybody on this floor, and some of you gentlemen here who know this to be the fact; some of you know my positive attitude during all of these years. But I am also a State rights man, and if South Carolina wants to have military training in her schools, I am opposed to denying her a fair access to the Treasury of the United States because she has some convictions about whether or not she wants military training in one or more of her schools. [Applause.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWAIN. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Is there any question of State rights involved in this?

Mr. McSWAIN. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The money comes out of the United States Treasury and is subject to the exclusive control of Congress and the War Department. How then is it a State rights question?

Mr. McSWAIN. Because a State that may be denied the right to participate in this fund has itself contributed money to that Federal fund, and that is where it comes in. Take the people of North Carolina that pays a million dollars a day into the Treasury of the United States. Do you say to her that her Agricultural and Mechanical College can not have one cent of this money unless they leave it optional with every Tom, Dick, and Harry when he comes in there as a freshman as to whether or not he will get up in the morning when the bugle blows? That is all it means. Let me tell you what is going to happen in South Carolina and every other State. In 1890, under the influence of the great Senator Tillman, the State of South Carolina set up the Clemson Agricultural and Mechanical College. You say that this is not a blow to the "essentially military" school. What is an "essentially military" school? Who is going to decide that question? There is no school that teaches nothing but military tactics and science. Military tactics and science is less than 10 per cent of what is taught by the most extreme military school in the country. It is less than 10 per cent of what is taught at West Point. The liberal arts and sciences are taught more than 90 per cent. West Point, according to that definition, would not be an essentially military school.

Under Governor Tillman we set up the Clemson Agricultural and Mechanical College. This amendment is aimed at land-grant colleges and at State universities. Make no mistake. It will cripple them.

Mr. REED of New York rose.

Mr. McSWAIN. Just a moment. When we in South Carolina set up that Clemson College we built our barracks, and we built it on the theory and assumption that it would be a strictly military school. Now, you say to us that we can not come in and get one cent of this fund unless we say to the boys in these barracks, "You can have your choice as to whether or not you will have the training." That means this: There are four boys in one room. The bugle blows in the morning. Three of them lie back and say, "I'll be durned if I'm going to get up for that bugle"; but the other one says, "Well, in order to get that \$107 a year that my daddy can not pay, if I am to stay in this college, I will crawl out of this good, warm bed and attend that formation."

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McSWAIN. No; excuse me, I want to finish this statement. We heard the gentleman make an eloquent argument, and it was a good one, as he usually makes. There are in South Carolina at least 500 young men in the Clemson College who would not be there to-day but for this fund. Why? Because they are paying not only for their uniform but paying cash for their training so that

they can use it to help pay their board, and I know of my own knowledge dozens and dozens of boys whose fathers under the present price of cotton could not keep them in the college but for the aid they receive from this fund. If there are 500 in South Carolina, I suspect there are probably 5,000 in some other big States, and perhaps 1,000 in Michigan, and perhaps 1,000 in Kansas; and some of your neighbors' boys are going to be turned out of school next fall if this amendment should be adopted. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman has not quite covered all of the ground.

Mr. McSWAIN. Then I ask my brother to help me cover it. It would take hours to tell the whole truth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia] merely provides for elective military training in the colleges and schools of the country, except at the essentially military schools. During the last year we had 131,038 enrolled in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

We had 15,544 in 55-C work. That is another branch of training in the schools. We had 2,300 in that branch below 55-C school work, making a total of 148,277 boys in the schools of the country taking various kinds of military training. They are given these courses for the purpose of helping, or at least we thought so, along the lines of military defense, so that we could make officers out of them; not privates, but officers. Out of all that number we got 6,514 reserve officers—only 6,514—and of those not more than half will be officers a few months from now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the gentleman want to know the reason?

Mr. COLLINS. I do not wish to yield just now. This shows that this particular work is worthless from the standpoint of military defense. Now, with regard to that particular work, I favor this amendment because it will create a situation where a boy can take the training if he wants to, and if it meets with the approval of his parents, but where no boy in a civil school will be drafted against his will. I do not like the present practice which forces practically every boy in the United States who desires to take a course in agriculture to take it with a course in military training. That is the situation to-day.

Mr. BEEDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I yield.

Mr. BEEDY. There has been a good deal said about this Congress taking away from local communities the right to set up their own educational systems. Does the gentleman not think it is just as valuable for us to guard the rights and freedom of choice in the youth of 18 years throughout the country as it is to look after the boards of trustees? [Applause.]

Mr. COLLINS. I certainly do. Now, that is the situation with reference to the farmer boys of this country. It is almost 100 per cent true with reference to courses in mechanics also.

Now, the attitude of the War Department is not only to put this training in the institutions but they require that an institution compel a boy who once enrolls in a military course to complete that course before he can be graduated in his academic subjects. Under the existing circumstances a boy could make a grade of 100 per cent in every school subject and be denied his diploma just because he failed in military drill. That is a deplorable situation for this country of ours.

Let us examine further the attitude of the War Department. Testimony before our committee showed that a school out in California was not permitted by the War De-

partment to change from compulsory to elective training. Last year they were listed in the War Department figures given our committee as having compulsory training. This year they have none. The department dropped them entirely when they tried to make drill elective.

Also notice the attitude of the Chief of Staff of the United States Army on this question. He ought to represent the official attitude. General Summerall said in his final report:

The most serious danger to the continued prosperity of the Reserve Officers Training Corps that has arisen in recent years lies in the effect of the decision of the Secretary of the Interior, sustained by the opinion of the Attorney General, that military training is not compulsory in land-grant colleges under the Morrill Act.

You see, the Chief of Staff of the United States Army favors the compulsory idea. Who can deny that that is the attitude of the Army?

Now let us go along a little further. This Congress is concerned with providing our country with military security. You can provide military security in only one way, and that is by providing our Army with modern fighting implements. These modern fighting implements, such as machine guns, the Christie tank that is out at the east door of the Capitol now, airplanes, and gas, cost money. If you provide these modern fighting implements, you will have to cut down your military personnel, because you can not have both.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COLLINS. Please let me finish.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We will save time.

Mr. COLLINS. No; it will not save time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I would like to show why—

Mr. COLLINS. I can not yield to the gentleman just now. I am sorry.

You can not have both. You can not have modern fighting implements and great armies of men, too. That tank out there can destroy every Reserve Officers' Training Corps unit in the country. How could boys perform fours right and fours left in the face of such hellish instrument of war as that? To attain a modern fighting force we must use modern fighting implements, and we can not do that within the limits of present appropriations. We must cut down our personnel in order to do it. Those of you who think you are militarists, who worship at the shrine of some captain or major or colonel, making daily reports to him on how you have acted in order to make his lot in life better, I want to say to that particular class that when you oppose such an amendment as this you are not working for military defense; you are working against military defense. You are not as military minded as you think you are; you are pacifists in sheep's clothing subtly undermining military security.

Captain Hart, the greatest military writer of this particular day, emphasizes the necessity of four instruments of warfare—the machine gun, gas, tanks, and airplanes.

He said that an army ought to be built around those four instrumentalities of warfare and that we ought to cut down the use of khaki. In other words, do not subject our boys to the folly of trying to fight the next war with man power, when machines will ruthlessly crush men. And if you train these boys in these obsolete methods you are worse off than if you had no training.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder how my friend from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] can believe that tanks and other war implements would be effective in the way of defense unless we have trained men to man them. [Applause.]

In the State of Florida we have a land-grant college. Twenty years ago, when I first entered that institution, there were approximately 200 students. To-day they have 2,200 or 2,300, for the simple reason that young men select it. They prefer to go to this institution, which is a military

institution. Military training there, of course, is not exacted of men who are not physically qualified for same. They have competent physicians to pass on the physical fitness of all young men—under 21 years of age—before they are required to drill.

That institution has grown also in efficiency, prestige, and general standing in proportion with and in keeping with its attendance growth. It is to-day one of the Nation's leading institutions of higher learning, drawing its student body from almost every State in the Union and from many foreign countries. Dr. John J. Tigert, former United States Commissioner of Education, is president of the University of Florida, and according to advice from him believes that Federal funds should continue for the land-grant colleges and that military training should be carried on in same.

Extensive military training is not given in these schools, but enough is had to teach the students necessary discipline, the importance of organized action, leadership, and punctuality. Their general health and incident mental efficiency is benefited. Our university, with its splendid faculty and great student body, is the pride of the entire State of Florida, and, in fact, its athletic teams, debating teams, and other student organizations have received most honorable mention, distinction, and recognition in many other States. It is furnishing trained, competent, and dependable leaders.

A large number of worthy students who are in financial need are receiving small financial benefits from the Federal funds. Without same many of them would be compelled to leave the university.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the LaGuardia amendment. It is against the best interests of our institutions of higher learning. Furthermore, it would restrict Federal money in such a manner as to give Federal interference with State education. I do not want Federal officials to tell my State's instructors to teach or not to teach certain subjects. The Florida State Board of Control and the faculty of the University of Florida are capable of deciding upon courses to be taught in our State's institutions; we do not want Federal restriction. If Florida wants military training in her university, let her have it; she is fully capable of guiding her own destiny in this respect.

A more capable or honorable board of control never served Florida than her present board. The board members are unselfish and patriotic. I gladly trust Florida's institutions of higher learning to their custody and care. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, for a long time I have paid attention to the subject of preparedness by the United States, and I notice that this debate quickly runs to that question. I was a Member of Congress in the years that approached the World War, and a Member of the Congress that declared war and then had to do many things crudely, hastily, and improperly because of unpreparedness. I was a Member also of the Congress that had to do with the building up and passage of the national defense act. That act was built up through much labor, and as a result of much painful experience on the part of the United States. That was in 1920, and from that day to this, through various sources, some of which we know, I have seen and you have seen the national defense act being stripped—weakened, cut down inch by inch. Look out. One does not have to be a militarist, but every one should be for the full sovereignty of the United States, and for all proper defense. I would not impugn the motives of any person nor would I even dare to call that valiant and militant fighter LaGuardia a pacifist, but I beg to call attention to the fact that his amendment, cleverly written so that it can pass muster as a germane amendment, is not really an amendment which should be considered in connection with the passage of an appropriation bill. If the Members of the House desire to discuss a matter of this kind, let a bill come before the House under a rule so that the whole membership may give full consideration to it. [Applause.] Do not write the proposal as a restriction on an appropriation bill.

What the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] has said about the need for ammunition and machinery is true enough, but, my friends, many of the same influences which are working in this particular instance, endeavor to hamper us there and make it increasingly difficult to get airplanes, men, and everything else we need for the protection of our sovereignty. The United States is a Nation with 123,000,000 people and with an Army of only about 118,000 officers and men. Is that anything to be afraid of? [Applause.] All the boys who can possibly be trained a little along military lines in these schools and universities will not make our Nation military-minded, and may help quite a bit in the general advance toward the order, the dignity and the feeling of security necessary in a great sovereign Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. LaGuardia. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LaGuardia. May I inquire how the time stands for and against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. After the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. CLAGUE] has spoken there will be one minute remaining.

Mr. LaGuardia. I am asking how the time stands for and against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has divided the time as equally as he could do so.

Mr. LaGuardia. Mr. Chairman, I am informed that the gentleman from Minnesota will speak against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Minnesota speaks against the amendment, there will be one minute remaining to those who are for the amendment.

Mr. CLAGUE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, there has been a great deal said here pro and con as to whether or not agricultural land-grant colleges can decide for themselves as to whether this military course shall be elective or compulsory. It has been stated by the chairman of the committee and by others that that is true. I want to call the attention of the members of the committee to an opinion rendered by the Attorney General. That opinion was rendered June 20, 1930, on this very question. I will state that the Wisconsin University is a land-grant college and they have an elective course. In substance this is what the Attorney General held. His opinion is rather lengthy and I will ask unanimous consent to incorporate it in my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLAGUE. The substance of the opinion is this: He holds that land-grant colleges can decide for themselves and the course can be elective. In taking up this question he says:

I therefore advise you that you are justified in considering that an agricultural college which offers a proper, substantial course in military tactics complies most efficiently with the requirements as to military tactics in the act of July 2, 1862, and the other acts above mentioned, even though the students of that institution are not compelled to take that course.

That was an opinion which bore directly on this question, and that opinion, as I say, was rendered June 20, 1930.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLAGUE. Yes.

Mr. REED of New York. That being true, there is an appropriation carried here for the commandants who are assigned from the Regular Army to each of these colleges, and the effect of this amendment would be to deprive them of their salaries and not permit this training to be given in the land-grant colleges.

Mr. CLAGUE. That is true.

Mr. STAFFORD. To a minor extent.

Mr. CLAGUE. The point I am making is this: We want to leave this up to the schools themselves. The agricultural college in the State of Minnesota is a land-grant college. Military training is now required, but the board of regents

of the Minnesota Agricultural College can make it elective if they so decide. The university regents of our State come from different districts in our State. They represent the people; they are a part of our own people, and if we decide we do not want military training it is up to our own people, so that each institution is left to determine this for itself.

Mr. COYLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLAGUE. Yes.

Mr. COYLE. I ask the gentleman to yield, in order that I may state that Doctor Richards, president of the Lehigh University, asks that the right to determine whether this training shall be compulsory or elective on the part of the students shall not be taken from the local authorities.

Mr. CLAGUE. The opinion of the Attorney General, referred to above, is as follows:

#### COURSES IN MILITARY TACTICS IN LAND-GRANT AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES

The Secretary of the Interior is justified in considering that an agricultural college which offers a proper, substantial course in military tactics complies sufficiently with the requirements as to military tactics in the act of July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503), and the amendatory acts, even though the students at that institution are not compelled to take that course.

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,

June 20, 1930.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 23, 1930, requesting my opinion as to whether agricultural colleges having grants under the act of July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503), and amendatory acts, are required to include military tactics among the compulsory courses of study, or whether they may simply offer this subject as an elective course.

The pertinent provision of the statute is contained in section 4, which reads as follows:

"And be it further enacted, that all moneys derived from the sale of the lands aforesaid by the States to which the lands are apportioned, and from the sales of land scrip hereinbefore provided for, shall be invested in stocks of the United States, or of the States, or some other safe stocks, yielding not less than 5 per cent upon the par value of said stocks; and that the moneys so invested shall constitute a perpetual fund, the capital of which shall remain forever undiminished (except so far as may be provided in section 5 of this act), and the interest of which shall be inviolably appropriated, by each State which may take and claim the benefit of this act, to the endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life."

Amendments of this section by the act of March 3, 1883 (ch. 102, 22 Stat. 484; U. S. C., title 7, sec. 304), and by the act of April 13, 1926 (ch. 130, 44 Stat. 247; U. S. C., Supp. III, title 7, sec. 304), reenacted the language printed in italics above without change.

By the act of August 30, 1890 (ch. 841, 26 Stat. 417), annual appropriation is made "for the more complete endowment and maintenance of colleges for the benefit of agriculture and mechanic arts now established, or which may be hereafter established in accordance with an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862 \* \* \*." By section 4 of this act the Secretary of the Interior is charged with its administration, and he is directed to ascertain and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury annually as to each State and Territory whether it is entitled to receive its share of the annual appropriation. There is no requirement that the moneys appropriated under this act shall be devoted by the State to an institution then teaching military tactics, but only to an institution which had been or should be established under the act of July 2, 1862. The act of August 30, 1890, provides that the money shall "be applied only to instruction in agriculture, the mechanic arts, the English language, and the various branches of mathematical, physical, natural, and economic science, with special reference to their applications in the industries of life and to the facilities for such instruction \* \* \*."

But by the act of March 4, 1907 (ch. 2907, 34 Stat. 1256, 1281), which appropriated additional money "for the more complete endowment and maintenance of agricultural colleges now established, or which may hereafter be established, in accordance with the act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and the act of Congress approved August 30, 1890, \* \* \*" it is provided that the money so appropriated is "to be applied only for the purposes of the agricultural colleges as defined and limited in the act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and the act of Congress approved August 30, 1890." Another paragraph of this statute provides that the payment of the money appropriated shall be governed by the provisions of the act of 1890.

Under these statutes you and your predecessors have recognized the duty, so far as the appropriations made by the act of March 4, 1907, are concerned, to withhold a certificate as to any State

which has not one or more colleges which are conducted in compliance with the provisions of the act of July 2, 1862. In determining whether such a certificate should be issued you are consequently confronted with the problem whether an institution, in order that it may comply with the act of July 2, 1862, must include military tactics as a compulsory course of study.

The statute nowhere specifically requires that the offered course in military tactics must be compulsory. My attention has been called to the fact that at the time when the original statute was passed in 1862 it appears that all or almost all courses offered in universities were compulsory, but, of course, this is not conclusive of the intention of Congress. The association of the word "military tactics" in the statute with the words "such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts" shows that there was no intention to require instruction in military tactics to be compulsory upon the student any more than those branches of learning related to agriculture and the mechanic arts. If one branch is compulsory all must be, and when we consider the great variety of branches which are related to agriculture and mechanic arts under the modern educational system, it is apparent that it would be impracticable to require any student to take all such courses. It is generally recognized that there is no obligation on agricultural colleges having land grants under the act of July 2, 1862, to compel their students to take any course related to agriculture or the mechanic arts. The use of the words "leading object" in the statute indicates that Congress must have intended to repose some discretion in the State or in the college to determine to what extent agriculture and the mechanic arts, scientific and classical studies, and military tactics should be taught or required. The additional provision of the statute that these branches of learning should be taught "in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe" also suggests that it was the purpose of Congress to leave to the States a wide measure of control in the administration of the statute.

I have given consideration to the legislative history of the act of 1862. The manner in which the language in question came to be inserted in the bill does not convince me that Congress intended the course in military tactics to be compulsory. If it had had such an intention, it seems fair to assume that it would have expressed that intention in clear language. An examination of the report of the speech of Mr. Morrill, of Vermont (Cong. Globe, 37th Cong., 2d sess., pt. 4, Appendix, p. 256), who had charge of this bill in the House, reveals no clear statement to the effect that it was contemplated that military training would be compulsory on all students.

I have also considered what was done after the passage of the act of 1862. From a memorandum submitted to me, it appears that in several of the States, at least, courses in military tactics were compulsory in the years immediately following the passage of the act. But in a letter to the Secretary of War, under date of July 19, 1923, the Acting Secretary of the Interior informed the Secretary of War that "the policy of the Department of the Interior has been that a State fulfills its obligation under the law when it offers instruction and provides facilities for instruction in the branches of learning specified in the land-grant college legislation."

This ruling was published in 1925 by the Bureau of Education of your department in a bulletin entitled "Federal Laws and Ruling Affecting Land-Grant Colleges." I understand that this policy has been consistently followed, and that cases presenting the precise question under consideration have arisen. The problem has in particular been presented with respect to the State of Wisconsin since 1923, for in that year the legislature of that State provided by statute that the study of military training at the State university should be optional. (Wisconsin Laws, 1923, ch. 226.) It is significant that in 1926 Congress, in amending the act of July 2, 1862, reenacted the precise language of the act of July 2, 1862, italicized at the outset of this opinion. The Supreme Court has held in *National Lead Co. v. U. S.* (252 U. S. 140, 146-147) that the reenactment of a statute while an administrative interpretation of the statute is in effect "amounts to an implied legislative recognition and approval of the executive construction of the statute; \* \* \* for Congress is presumed to have legislated with knowledge of such an established usage of an executive department of the Government. (*U. S. v. Bailey*, 9 Pet. 238, 256.)" To the same effect are *U. S. v. Cerecedo Hermanos y Compania* (209 U. S. 337, 339); *U. S. v. Falk & Bro.* (204 U. S. 143, 149).

I am of the opinion that the construction of the statute adopted by your department is a reasonable one, and it was in effect approved by Congress by the reenactment of the language in question after the adoption and publication of that construction by your department. Added force is given to the reenactment of this language by the fact that it occurred after the legislation in Wisconsin referred to above.

I therefore advise you that you are justified in considering that an agricultural college which offers a proper, substantial course in military tactics complies sufficiently with the requirement as to military tactics of the act of July 2, 1862, and the other acts above mentioned, even though the students at that institution are not compelled to take that course.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM D. MITCHELL.

To the SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the proposed amendment, there is but one question involved and that is whether the people of the respective States shall determine whether or not they want voluntary or compulsory military training in their schools.

The fact that this item is voted for commits the Congress to military training in the schools, does it not? This amendment, if adopted, would not reduce by one penny the money appropriated by Congress for military training in the schools. The fact that you will still allow to any student, if this amendment is adopted, \$107, if that is the proper amount, who will accept military training, shows the Congress is putting a premium upon taking military training in the schools, does it not? All right, now, if you are going to vote for the item, the only remaining question, as I see it, is whether or not the judgment of the Congress or the judgment of the legislatures shall determine whether or not the people of the respective States shall or shall not have military training; and for one, I believe the people of my State and my legislature are just as capable of determining this question for the people of Texas as this Congress [applause], and it is none of your business. [Applause.]

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, no one urging State rights can properly stand in the face of this appropriation bill and the national defense act, because the national defense act took every vestige of State rights away from your National Guard and away from your military training. This training is being carried on in your State colleges with Federal money, with War Department officers, and you have not one word to say about it.

Now, let us be fair about it. That is all there is to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BARBOUR) there were—ayes 50, noes 162.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. On page 54, line 17, change the figures "451" to "455" in the citation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARBOUR: Page 54, line 17, strike out "451" and insert "455."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For arms, ammunition, targets, and other accessories for target practice, for issue and sale in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and approved by the Secretary of War, in connection with the encouragement of rifle practice, in pursuance of the provisions of law, \$200,000.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LA GUARDIA). The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McSWAIN: Page 60, line 10, after the word "law," strike out "\$200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$250,000."

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes in discussing this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for 10 minutes in order that I may explain that this amendment will involve, to a certain degree, a departure in policy, the beginning of a new régime in civilian rifle training, and I desire sufficient time, or at least some time, to seek to explain and justify such change.

The American Legion at its national convention in Boston in October, 1930, passed a resolution asking the Congress to continually increase its appropriations for this purpose until gradually there may be sufficient funds in the years to come

to equip and accommodate one civilian rifle club for every American Legion post in the country.

Now, there are about 12,000 of these posts. At present there are about 116 posts that are desiring equipment in order to be organized and to commence their activities. There are at present in existence 1,600 such clubs.

I have a certain, definite belief that this is one of the very best ways and one of the most economical ways to achieve and to maintain a reasonable degree of preparedness. Several years ago I planned to establish a rifle range on one of my own little farms for the convenience of the citizens of the community and of the American Legion Post, but my plans were frustrated by reason of the fact that a gentleman came along and offered me about all that the land was worth. Now, I am glad I sold it, and I fear he is sorry he bought it. This is a mere incident explaining that years ago, before the American Legion acted, I realized the great importance of this plan upon a plan of wise preparedness of the individual citizens to function in time of war.

I agree with much that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] has said during the consideration of this bill with reference to the kind of arms that are most effective in time of war. Though I differ in certain fundamental principles from the gentleman of Mississippi, I think that the gentleman [Mr. COLLINS] has rendered a certain service in being persistent in his opposition to what might be called the anachronisms of the Military Establishment and insisting that they come up to date. I think that in a democracy a contrariety of ideas is always valuable and in the end conduces to wise decisions, but I submit that in addition to the four weapons that the gentleman mentioned as being indispensable in war—and they are—there is one weapon that is still highly indispensable and perhaps will be vital for generations to come, and that weapon is the individual rifle.

The man with the rifle is able to protect machine guns in advancing to position. The man with the rifle is thus able to help the machine gun function. The rifle can not do much to protect the airplane, but for these other weapons, as tanks and poisonous gas, the rifle is indisputably an auxiliary, and under some conditions of open warfare of movement is essential and indispensable.

In the next place the citizenry that knows how to use a rifle constitutes the most economical system for national defense. I submit, gentlemen, after a study on the ground of the Swiss Army on two different occasions, and after having read about it for many years, that the most economical, in proportion to its cost, the most efficient army now in the world or that ever has been in the world, is the Swiss Army.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWAIN. I will.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I understand in Switzerland it is the policy to train every able-bodied male and to encourage them in shooting?

Mr. McSWAIN. I was coming to that. In Switzerland there are over 4,000 civilian voluntary rifle clubs. Switzerland has a population of not quite 4,000,000. On that proportion there would be 120,000 rifle clubs in the United States. Now, the American Legion is only asking for one-twentieth of the number that exists in Switzerland to-day.

Now, what about the rifle? The Swiss for 17 years won the championship in 17 different matches. Every Swiss man from 21 to 48, every able-bodied man, must go upon the range every year and must make a passing grade, and if he does not, he has to go back and try it over.

Upon a Swiss holiday or Saturday afternoon upon the trains or trolleys going out of all the larger cities you will find civilian soldiers rushing from the factory, from the shop, or other work place with a rifle slung across his back, headed for the rifle range.

Now, what was the proof of the Swiss Army's efficiency during the World War? Germany was tempted to cross into Switzerland as well as over Belgium. Switzerland was nothing more to Germany than Belgium. But what hap-

pened? As soon as Germany began mobilizing her troops Switzerland mobilized an army of 200,000 men, and for four years Germany did not dare to cross the borders into Switzerland's territory. Why? Because when a Swiss rifleman fires there is going to be a dead man at the other end of the course of the bullet. Germany knew that. Other soldiers may raise the rifle, shut their eyes and shoot, and not do much damage, but when a Swiss soldier fires the result is a dead man. [Applause.] It takes practice to make a good rifle shot. In 1910 the Swiss population fired 10 shots for every man, woman, and child in Switzerland. But in Germany that same year—and Germany thought she was preparing to fight—in Germany they fired only one-half a shot for every man, woman, and child. In France it was the same; they fired only one-half a shot for every man, woman, and child. But in Switzerland they fired per capita twenty times as many shots as were fired in Germany or France.

Now, Switzerland is a liberty-loving country. It is the oldest republic in the world. For nearly 700 years they have been a free people. The Swiss believe in fighting for liberty and in fighting to maintain liberty, and I want to submit this thought, after some rather careful reading, that I believe that a fair investigation of the pages of history will show it to be true, that no people ever won or kept their liberty that were not able and willing to win it by force of arms. [Applause.]

No people will ultimately retain liberty unless they are willing and able to retain it by war. What we have to do is to draw the sharp line of demarcation between a policy of aggressive war and a policy of preparedness for defensive war. We in America must draw the line. That is what I think America has ever done, and nothing that I now see makes me apprehensive at all that America ever will become dangerously aggressive in the matter of war. But we must be on the alert. We must watch and resist any such tendency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. McSWAIN was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

#### SWITZERLAND AS THE NURSERY OF PEACE

If there ever was a country where the people rule, it is Switzerland. If there ever was a people that are devoted to peace, it is the Swiss people. Practically all the international activities of the world have originated in Switzerland and now center around Switzerland. Such cooperative agencies as the International Postal Union and the International Telegraph Union are in Switzerland. In Geneva, Switzerland, was held the first international arbitration conference, being between the United States and Great Britain, concerning the claim for damages by the United States against Great Britain growing out of the raids upon American commerce by British raiders during the War between the States. An award was made against Great Britain and promptly paid. That was the first instance in history of two great nations voluntarily agreeing in the interest of peace to submit their claims to human arbitration.

In Switzerland originated the great Red Cross movement to alleviate the hardships and some of the horrors of war. Swiss authors and statesmen have been leaders in every movement to clarify and to codify international law, and thus to remove the cause for friction which so often brings on war. Upon Swiss territory, as on neutral ground, have been held practically all the conferences since the Paris Peace Conference, for setting up the framework of friendship among the hitherto warring nations. At Geneva, in Switzerland, is the seat of the League of Nations. Here is the permanent Secretariat. Here meets annually the Assembly of the League of Nations. Here periodically the Council of the League of Nations is in session.

#### THE PEACEFUL SWISS ALWAYS PREPARED FOR DEFENSE

So if there be any place in the world where the sentiment for peace is strong, it is Switzerland. And yet, if there be

any people that are prepared constantly, every man of them, to fight in defense of his rights, and to fight in defense of peace, it is the Swiss. For centuries the Swiss have been known as skillful and courageous fighters. The French monarchs formerly engaged Swiss guards for the protection of their persons. Even to this good day, the Swiss guards constitute one of the most picturesque features of the Vatican. Fortunately, the Swiss have wisely found the safe middle ground between extreme and expensive militarism on the one hand and pitiful and helpless unpreparedness on the other. The Swiss citizen is a very realistic person. He looks the world square in the face. He knows that force still has its place in the world. The Swiss draws a lesson from the fact that no little town in a Christian country, where the people all know each other, and many of them interrelated by blood or marriage, all speaking the same language, all professing the same religion, all sending their children to the same school, yet no such little town can be found but must have its policeman, with his pistol and his billet to compel the unruly and lawless minority to obey the will of the sober and law-abiding majority.

#### THE SAFE AND SANE MIDDLE GROUND

How did the Swiss find this happy middle ground between the perils of militarism, which may provoke aggressive war, and the equal perils of pacifism, which may invite aggressive war? Two salient features may be pointed out as the explanation. First is, they have practically eliminated the professional soldier. There are very few professional soldiers on the pay rolls of the Swiss Government. Those few consist of highly trained and very capable officers who study to keep abreast of the military art so as to impart their information to the citizen soldiers at their annual training periods. The Swiss have found, what other nations can find if they seek, that the art of war is not so complex, nor so modern, as to require the entire time and thought of officers in order to keep them posted. The Swiss have discovered that their officers can give to their families and to their business enough time to continue in the working world as producers, and yet out of their leisure and during their holidays, be able to devote sufficient attention to the progress in the military art as to keep fully abreast. I feel safe in asserting that you will find in banks, in law offices, in mercantile establishments, in factories, and upon the farms of Switzerland, busy men who hold commissions as officers in the citizen army of Switzerland, who are the equals in general intelligence and in special knowledge and technical skill in the military art of any professional full-time officers drawing all-the-year pay from the public treasury in any country. These citizen soldiers have the civilian point of view. Their careers are connected with civil life. Therefore, ambition to win fame and honor upon the field of battle are not dominant forces in their lives. Their attitude is naturally defensive. They say to other nations:

If you let us alone, we will let you alone. But if you invade us, we are prepared to defend our soil and to destroy you in your efforts to destroy us.

The second important factor in explaining why Switzerland has maintained the safe middle ground in preparedness is that the private soldier feels an individual responsibility to fit himself in the highest possible degree to defend his country and his country's liberties. Here we escape pacifism. Every male citizen is expected to take proper training in the use of arms and in cooperative action with his fellow citizens in fighting. These two things constitute the essentials of military training. A good rifleman may understand how to shoot, but he must also understand how to get himself in the proper position in company with large numbers of his fellow citizens, in order that their combined and cooperative fighting may be effective against the combined and cooperative fighting of the enemy. Consequently the Swiss Army is a democratic army. Its ideals are as democratic as the civil and business and industrial and commercial institutions with which the people are familiar. Every private soldier has it in his power by skill and initia-

tive to rise to the grade of noncommissioned officer. Every noncommissioned officer is encouraged and trained so that the best, the most capable in skill, in knowledge, and in the quality of leadership, are given commissioned rank. Therefore, the officers in the Swiss Army represent natural leaders just as the leaders among the lawyers at the bar, just as the leaders in the banking world, just as the leaders in the commercial and industrial world have won their positions of leadership by ability, by character, and by the power to inspire confidence in others. This is the very essence of leadership.

#### THE ECONOMY OF A CITIZEN ARMY

Consequently the military defense forces of Switzerland are very inexpensive. The cost is a mere bagatelle in comparison with the cost per capita in many other countries, including the United States. I will gather the figures and put them into the *RECORD* later, so that the contrast in expense may show impressively that the only escape from the weight of land armaments in our country is to gradually modify our military system from one so largely and dominantly professional to a voluntary citizen army. I previously called attention to this fact in connection with my comments upon a very able discussion of this general subject by Gen. John M. Palmer, United States Army, retired, in his book entitled "Statesmen or War." He shows very clearly how, if we Members of Congress are to be real statesmen in connection with preparedness, we will draw more lessons from the experience of Switzerland and will insure that our Nation will never in the future enter upon aggressive warfare, but that we will always be prepared to defend ourselves against the ambition and the greed of other nations.

#### THE RIFLE ESSENTIAL TO EVERY SOLDIER

Now this all leads to the question of encouraging civilian rifle practice. The rifle is the elemental and indispensable weapon of every soldier. The soldier may later turn to artillery, or to machine guns, or to tanks, or to gas warfare, or to airplanes, but the beginning of his training must include a knowledge of how to use small firearms. For a man to know how to shoot accurately, to be familiar with the loading and the care of a rifle and pistol, gives confidence and creates self-respect. Therefore, the larger the number of men in the United States connected with civil life who are good riflemen, the better our Nation will be prepared for defense. These expert riflemen, learning to shoot in a civilian rifle club, can be employed with great benefit in the training of soldiers hastily called out of civil life in the event of war. To obtain a knowledge of the necessary elements of drill is a matter of a few weeks to a person of average intelligence. To become a good shot is a matter of experience of months, and sometimes years. We will never have universal military training in America. It is contrary to the genius of American institutions. But we have always had voluntary military training for a part of our citizens. The larger the number of citizens willing to submit to voluntary training, the smaller the number of citizens whom we must enroll as regular soldiers and keep on the pay roll all the year round.

There is an essential difference and even antagonism between the voluntary soldier and the mercenary soldier. There is a sort of essential antagonism between the professional soldier and the citizen soldier. The professional soldier is disposed to look down with contempt upon the military fitness of the citizen soldier. The citizen soldier reciprocates this feeling and nurses the grudges of the unfairness and injustice that he has suffered at the hands of the professional soldier during periods of training and during the stress of war.

#### MORE VOLUNTEERS MEANS FEWER MERCENARIES

I stand for increasing the number of voluntary soldiers in the United States; for increasing the number of men who are willing to train, to study, to submit to discipline, and thus to be prepared to fight the Nation's battles in a war of defense. We submit to a regular, mercenary, profes-

sional army only as a matter of necessity. If we could have equally well-trained officers and equally well-trained soldiers without having to pay them all the time and without the incidental encouragement they give to the militaristic spirit, we would welcome such a change. For this reason the American Legion, made up exclusively of citizens who were formerly, for a period of time, enlisted in the defense of the Nation's rights and of the Nation's life, stands for the voluntary spirit in war. The American Legion wants to encourage the citizen soldier. The American Legion wants adequate preparedness at the minimum of necessary expense. For this reason the American Legion has set up a program of having at least 12,000 civilian rifle clubs in the United States. Perhaps there will be more than 12,000 such clubs before the full program is developed. There will probably be other American Legion posts established, and at any rate there will be communities where there is now no American Legion post, which will organize rifle clubs. Some cities, where there is only one American Legion post, will have two or more rifle clubs.

So the question is, What encouragement will Congress give to the formation and maintenance of these clubs? Will Congress furnish the rifles, which are in storage for use by these clubs? Will Congress furnish the ammunition, which is now in storage and annually depreciating and deteriorating, for use by these clubs? Will Congress furnish some money to encourage sending teams to visit the annual matches and some money to buy trophies for the winners at the annual matches? If Congress will do these things, then if we do become involved in another major war the military authorities then in control will find that the money now proposed to be spent upon these rifle clubs will pay dividends one hundred and perhaps one thousand fold. The citizen who has never had on a uniform but who knows how to use a rifle accurately and quickly is a potential soldier of the finest sort. Such a soldier as Alvin York, familiar with the use of the rifle in hunting squirrels or turkeys or other big game, became in battle the equal of a hundred or a thousand soldiers not entirely familiar with the use of the rifle. The miraculous success of Andrew Jackson at New Orleans is explained not alone by his own dauntless courage and his own matchless leadership but also by the fact that the backwoodsmen who constituted the rank and file of his army had learned through years of practice in the woods to use their rifles with deadly effect. Such citizen, when called to the colors in time of war, is quickly and easily converted over into an efficient and capable soldier.

#### CIVILIANS MUST CONSTITUTE ANY SIZABLE ARMY

Therefore, the greatest and widest training should be carried on among civilians and such citizen soldiers as national guardsmen, with all the implements and instrumentalities of modern war. Our airplanes should be at the disposal of national guardsmen who want to learn how to do military flying. Machine guns should be at their disposal. The latest types of army tanks should be at their disposal. They should be constantly drilled and instructed in the use of poisonous gases. But they must not neglect the rifle. The rifle is the alphabet of the soldier. To learn its use is like learning the a, b, c's. With hundreds of thousands of our citizens familiar with the rifle, with the airplane, with the machine gun, with the tank, with the trench mortar, with the use of poisonous gases, it will be possible for our Nation to call together in short order an army composed of civilians that will and can defend our rights, protect our people, and repel the invader from our land.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I can agree with practically everything said by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN] except that part of his remarks in favor of the amendment which seeks to add \$50,000 to this item of \$200,000 already in the bill. This activity of the civilian rifle clubs has been carried along for some time at just about the same level. The appropriation for some years past has been \$200,000 for the civilian rifle clubs, and that is in addition to the \$500,000 for national matches held

every year at Camp Perry and for other expenses in connection with the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice. It is to maintain these 1,600 clubs. The question is now whether we want to embark on a campaign or program that is going to increase these national rifle clubs without limit. If we start in here and add \$50,000—and they have been seeking for several years, not by offering amendments on the floor, but by coming before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the War Department and asking that this sum be increased—there is no telling where it will end. They frankly tell us now that their program is to extend this activity to thousands of these clubs. A gentleman who appeared before the committee said 12,000 additional clubs. I believe this country should do everything possible to foster and promote marksmanship and proficiency in arms. Americans have always been noted for their proficiency in marksmanship and in arms. That is something we want to see maintained among our people, and if the \$50,000 were necessary to do that, I would be just as much in favor of it as anyone.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?  
Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. McSWAIN. If 112 clubs are now seeking for necessary aid in order to start, and there is not a sufficient fund, would it not seem to justify an appropriation of the additional \$50,000?

Mr. BARBOUR. If we were neglecting this activity, I would be inclined to agree with the gentleman, but does the gentleman from South Carolina know what we are doing in this program that we are now carrying on?

Mr. McSWAIN. We have 1,600 clubs now, and we are doing well as far as we go.

Mr. BARBOUR. Just let me call the attention of the gentleman from South Carolina and of the other Members of the House to just what this country is doing in order to promote marksmanship and proficiency in arms at the present time in this very bill now before us.

For target practice there is carried in this bill for the Regular Army \$3,034,960. That is for target practice alone. For the National Guard there is carried in this bill for target practice \$2,246,531. For the Organized Reserves for target practice there is carried \$614,792, for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps for target practice there is carried \$345,476, for the citizens' military training camps for target practice, \$95,649; for the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice for the national matches, \$500,000; and for the civilian rifle clubs, \$700,000, making a total for target practice already carried in this bill of \$7,037,408. But that is not all. There is an item in this bill of \$1,500,000 for additional pay to enlisted men in the Army because of proficiency in arms and in marksmanship. The latest figures that I have from the War Department are that over 16,000 enlisted men are drawing this additional pay, because of proficiency in marksmanship. If we were neglecting marksmanship in this country I would be inclined to vote for the amendment which the gentleman offers, but with more than eight and a half million dollars already in the bill to make ourselves in this country proficient in arms and in marksmanship, I think we are spending an adequate sum for this purpose.

Mr. McSWAIN. Will not the gentleman separate the items here for instruction in rifle practice for the civilian population?

Mr. BARBOUR. To my mind it is all for the same purpose, to foster and encourage proficiency in rifle practice in this country, and it does not make so much difference whether you do it as a civilian or as a National Guard man or as an Organized Reserve or as a Regular Army man. If you can shoot and hit the bull's-eye, you are a good marksman.

Mr. McSWAIN. Certainly, but the gentleman must realize this, that target practice for the Regular Army and for the National Army is an indispensable, essential part of the training, just like the drill and the uniforms.

It ought to be charged up to the entire establishment, and it is not fair, from an argumentative point of view to charge it against an effort to enlarge training amongst civilians who will be familiar with the rifle so that if a war does come they will then be prepared to continue to shoot straight just like Alvin York was. Alvin York learned to shoot at turkey shooting matches in east Tennessee, and he hit Germans as well as turkeys.

Mr. BARBOUR. It is not my intention to charge this to the civilian activities. I just wanted to show to the Members of the House the total amount of money carried in this bill for marksmanship and proficiency in arms so that you would understand it is not being neglected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### CORPS OF ENGINEERS

#### CALIFORNIA DÉBRIS COMMISSION

For defraying the expenses of the commission in carrying on the work authorized by the act approved March 1, 1893 (U. S. C., title 33, sec. 661), \$17,350.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There is a subsequent item that refers to an appropriation of \$1,000,000 for the work of flood control on the Sacramento River.

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes. That is under flood control.

Mr. STAFFORD. That has been running along for a number of years. What is the special work that is accomplished by that appropriation? I believe this California Débris Commission is in control of that.

Mr. BARBOUR. That is a different proposition. This California Débris Commission is in control of the debris that is washed down from the mines up in the mountains. It is still coming because of the old hydraulic mining done in the early days.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thought that was the justification for the \$1,000,000 appropriation for the Sacramento River.

Mr. BARBOUR. Well, in a way, it was, but the debris commission is a board which studies and keeps in touch with that situation.

Mr. STAFFORD. This California Débris Commission has authority over the expenditure of this \$1,000,000, as I recall it?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The only justification for this appropriation of \$1,000,000 which has been appropriated for several years is that the waters came down from the mountains above Sacramento and there should be some Federal appropriation to control the works.

Mr. BARBOUR. There are two different propositions. There is flood control and navigation and there is the matter of taking care of the debris that comes down and interferes with the navigation of the stream. Of course, the two are somewhat related.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is not much navigation up there, is there?

Mr. BARBOUR. In the Sacramento River there is a great deal of navigation as far as Sacramento and somewhat beyond.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the character of navigation?

Mr. BARBOUR. It is passenger and freight.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thought the people of California were faster moving than to go by boat, by the slow process of navigation up the Sacramento River.

Mr. BARBOUR. Well, it is a very delightful overnight trip. You can make it in three hours on a train easily, or you can leave San Francisco by boat in the early evening and be in Sacramento in the morning in time for breakfast. It is a delightful, restful trip by river, and a great many people take it.

Mr. STAFFORD. In order to provide a good night's rest for sleepy Californians, you are asking us to appropriate \$1,000,000 for navigation?

Mr. BARBOUR. Even for people from Wisconsin it might do a lot of good.

Mr. STAFFORD. It might do a lot of good, but as they are fast actors out there, they would not think of taking a boat to travel a short distance like that when they could travel by train in three hours. They would likely take this metal-clad airship. No. I do not believe they would take that, because they are too wise to experiment with a thing as dangerous as that.

Mr. BARBOUR. I am sure if the gentleman were out there and wanted to have a delightful night's rest he could not enjoy anything more than a trip on one of these boats to Sacramento.

Mr. STAFFORD. Perhaps I would need a refreshing night's rest after the wild life in San Francisco.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Not only do they have a line of steamers such as described by the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR], but there is a heavy tonnage handled on the Sacramento River.

Mr. STAFFORD. Consisting of what, other than logs?

Mr. McDUFFIE. The rail lines do not closely parallel the Sacramento River, and there are a number of towns between Sacramento and San Francisco which are served by this line of steamers, which are packet boats. This line also runs on as far as Stockton.

Mr. STAFFORD. I had heard of the packet-boat line, but I never knew they had much passenger travel.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I was surprised myself to learn that. I do not recall the figures just now, but the engineer's report shows a vast amount of tonnage on the Sacramento River.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, there is no question about the tonnage as far as logs are concerned.

Mr. McDUFFIE. And this is also high-class tonnage, fruits and vegetables.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works, and for the prosecution of such projects heretofore authorized as may be most desirable in the interests of commerce and navigation; for survey of northern and northwestern lakes, Lake of the Woods, and other boundary and connecting waters between the said lake and Lake Superior, Lake Champlain, and the natural navigable waters embraced in the navigation system of the New York canals, including all necessary expenses for preparing, correcting, extending, printing, binding, and issuing charts and bulletins and of investigating lake levels with a view to their regulation; for examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors: *Provided*, That no funds shall be expended for any preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate not authorized by law; and for the prevention of obstructive and injurious deposits within the harbor and adjacent waters of New York City, for pay of inspectors, deputy inspectors, crews, and office force, and for maintenance of patrol fleet and expenses of office, \$80,000,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, on page 71, line 18, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLANTON: Page 71, line 18, strike out the words "preliminary examination."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak for five minutes out of order.

Mr. BARBOUR. Well, Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we are trying to finish this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I have not used a moment on this bill.

Mr. BARBOUR. But we are trying to get it out of the way, so that another bill can come on for general debate.

Mr. BLANTON. I could speak for five minutes on these two words, but I would like to mention a convention that is being held in this city.

Mr. BARBOUR. I know the gentleman could speak for more than five minutes.

I will not object in this instance, Mr. Chairman, with the understanding that this shall not be a precedent for any similar request, because if there is a similar request I shall have to object.

Mr. BLANTON. I shall not ask for any further time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, there is now in session in this city a convention of delegates from the oil-producing States, called by the governors of those States, to devise some means of relief for the independent oil operators of the country. They have their backs to the wall, caused by imports of foreign oil annually entered free, and must have tariff protection at once.

They held a most enlightening meeting in the House caucus room this morning which Senators, Representatives in Congress, and a great number of delegates from the oil-producing States attended. I listened to some splendid addresses there, one of which was worthy of special mention, that made by Mr. Wirt Franklin, of Oklahoma City. Mr. Franklin, fortunately for the independent producers, is a man of wealth. He has spent, so I am reliably told, out of his own pocket about \$200,000 in efforts to aid and assist those engaged in his industry and to collect information and facts on the subject he so ably discussed. He made a most valuable statement before that meeting in the House caucus room this morning. It has so much important information and so many important facts correlated in it, which I have been trying to get for a long time, and which I am sure the Members of Congress from the various oil-producing States have been trying to get for a long time, that I would like to have it go in the RECORD in connection with my remarks. I ask unanimous consent to incorporate the statement he made in the caucus room this morning as a part of my remarks.

Mr. BARBOUR. Who made the statement?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Wirt Franklin, of Oklahoma City, who is the president of the Independent Oil Producers' Association in that portion of the United States.

Mr. PARKS. He is the man who is fighting the Standard Oil Co. and Shell people.

Mr. BLANTON. Do not say that, because some friend of the big Dutch Shell Co. might come in here and object to the remarks going in the RECORD.

Mr. PARKS. Maybe they did not hear me.

Mr. BLANTON. These facts are of importance to the whole country, and this industry just now is the very life of a part of my district. Right now there are many farmers out of jobs who have been making a living for their wives and little children by reason of the independent oil industry in my district, and they have been able in this way to make a living when they have not been able to make ends meet out of their farms.

Mr. PARKS. And the same thing is true in my district.

Mr. BLANTON. When the independent operators were getting \$1.50 a barrel for their oil they were paying these farm boys \$10 and \$12 a day for truck hauling, for casing crews, for tool dressing, and tower shifts. There were hundreds of them employed in all of the oil counties of my district, and they were given needed and remunerative employment by the independent oil operators, but now they are all out of jobs. Oil has gone down to-day another 25 cents, thus reducing the price in Texas to about 60 cents a barrel, and under the proration existing, men who have little 10-barrel wells have been cut to five barrels per day production. They can not produce but five barrels per day, and you men know they can not do that except at a great loss.

I intended to see my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL] before I made this request. I notice that he is about to make his usual objection. And he renders valuable service along that line. I can assure him that this is of great importance to the country, to Pennsylvania, to Ohio, to Indiana, and to many of the States that are now

crippled by reason of the independent producers having their backs to the wall. It is of great importance to the country, and I hope my friend from Massachusetts will let it go in.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I was interested in the gentleman's statement that the price of oil was very low.

Mr. BLANTON. It is down to 60 cents a barrel, as there was a cut of 25 cents to-day in Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I was about to say that there was a cut of 25 cents yesterday.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; which reduced it to 60 cents a barrel, and the big Dutch Shell Co. can lay down gasoline in New York to-day from its South American plant for 4 cents a gallon and it sells here for 16 cents a gallon.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if I thought that the insertion of this speech in the RECORD would give employment to one individual outside of the Printing Office, or if I thought it would improve the oil situation in any State, I would not object; but, Mr. Chairman, the increase in the cost of publishing the RECORD last year was \$175,000 plus. There are just 560 subscribers outside of Congress to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Each Member of the House has 60 copies and each Member of the Senate has 80 copies, and the cost of printing the RECORD is more than the cost of printing anything else in the Printing Office in connection with any Government activity.

Mr. BLANTON. Yet the people get more value for this money than from any other we spend.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I do not yield to the gentleman, and I did not interrupt him. It has become a scandal. The RECORD is for recording the procedure of this House, a legitimate function, and to have it on file for posterity or for the convenience of the Members.

Mr. BLANTON. I am going to act in good faith with my friend from California [Mr. BARBOUR], who allowed me this time, and I am going to withdraw my request for the time being, if it is going to provoke an argument.

(Subsequently the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. UNDERHILL, withdrew his objection, and by unanimous consent the gentleman from Texas, Mr. BLANTON, was granted permission to incorporate in the RECORD as a part of his remarks the statement made by Mr. Wirt Franklin.)

The statement is as follows:

SPEECH OF WIRT FRANKLIN TO GOVERNORS' OIL RELIEF CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 15, 1931

We have been called together to-day by the governors of the oil-producing States for the purpose of working out plans for prompt relief for the present dire distress in the petroleum industry. The situation is so serious as to merit the best thought of the leaders from the several States involved in the solution of our difficulties.

That we may understand the many problems with which we are confronted and the underlying causes of our existing depression, I deem it advisable to review briefly the history of the industry for the past 10 years, the policies and purposes of those in authority, and the leaders of the industry, which have had considerable influence in bringing about, if they are not directly responsible for, the present conditions.

Let us go back to the year 1921, when conditions very similar to those of the present were prevalent in the petroleum industry, brought about at that time by vast importations of oil, chiefly from Mexico. Then there was under consideration in the Committee on Ways and Means, at that time under the chairmanship of Mr. Fordney, the question of giving protection to this industry by the levying of a tariff on imported crude oil. The Committee on Ways and Means of the House had voted a tariff on oil in the then pending bill, and President Harding at that time, in a letter to Mr. Fordney requesting that a tariff on oil be omitted from the bill, for the first time declared the Government's policy of so-called conservation, which will be more fully analyzed and defined after I have traced its course and effect from that date to the present time. Congress failed to give oil the protection to which it was then entitled; but the Mexican Government shortly thereafter levied an export tax upon oil which, to some extent at least, was an aid to the domestic industry. Thereafter the production of oil in Mexico gradually declined, while exploration and development work was begun in Venezuela, Colombia, and other South American countries.

In 1924, continuing the policy first enunciated by President Harding in 1921, President Coolidge appointed four members of his Cabinet as the Federal Oil Conservation Board, with the Secretary of the Interior as chairman. This board held hearings for the purpose of determining the extent of our petroleum reserves. The aid of the American Petroleum Institute was asked and given, and the country was alarmed at the reports emanating from the board and leaders of the petroleum industry that our petroleum reserves were in danger of exhaustion within a few years, and that even our safety as a nation was at stake. This was no new thing, as men prominent in the industry and others had for years, from time to time, made predictions of the early exhaustion of our oil resources. The rank and file of the producing branch of the business paid little heed to the hearings before the Federal Oil Conservation Board, or to the warnings of those timid souls who prophesied the early demise of the petroleum industry in the United States. They did not believe these predictions, thought them harmless, and did not then foresee the results of their indifference.

The major factors in the industry, many of whom held large concessions in Central and South America, participated in the hearings and aided in the dissemination to the people and the officials of the State and Federal Governments of information tending to convince the country of the early exhaustion of this irreplaceable natural resource, and to crystallize public sentiment in favor of hoarding our supplies, unused, for future generations. For years the press has been filled, to such an extent as to amount to propaganda, with the predictions and forebodings of these prophets of disaster. Whatever merit this so-called conservation policy had at its inception, subsequent developments have conclusively shown that the same was founded upon a false foundation of fact; that the use of the word "conservation" in connection with this policy was not in its true sense; that instead it meant reservation of our supplies in the ground, and the effect has been to mislead the people into believing that we were wasting our petroleum resources, which was far from the truth.

In 1928 it became apparent that there was an oversupply of oil being thrown upon the markets of the United States, due to increasing domestic production and increasing imports, chiefly from Venezuela. The American Petroleum Institute created a committee on world production and consumption, the avowed purpose of which was to bring about a curtailment of production in the United States and a curtailment of imports, so as to bring production and imports in balance with consumption. Elaborate plans were formulated early in 1929, were submitted to the Federal Oil Conservation Board, and by that board referred to the Attorney General for the purpose of ascertaining whether the plan could be carried out without violation of the antitrust laws. The Attorney General could not promise immunity, and the work of the committee, covering the production of the country as a whole, was discontinued. In lieu thereof committees for curtailment of production were set to work in the various States, under the authority of State laws where same existed, and these State committees and subcommittees in the various districts within the States have succeeded to a remarkable degree in reducing the production of oil within the United States. As a corollary of this work and as a part of it, the plan contemplated the curtailment of production in the countries of South America, particularly Venezuela, which, had it succeeded, would have resulted in a reduction of imports of crude oil and refined products into the United States.

In the early part of 1929 Mr. M. L. Requa, reported at the time to be acting in behalf of President Hoover, called upon the governors of the several oil-producing States to enlist their aid in holding a conference of the petroleum industry, and later called such a conference to meet at Colorado Springs, Colo., on June 10, 1929. This conference was attended by several of the governors and also by a large number of delegates from the various oil-producing States, representing all branches of the industry. The conference was opened by Mr. Requa, with a statement of the aims thereof. Doctor Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior, again announced the conservation policies of the Federal Oil Conservation Board, and Dr. George Otis Smith, Director of the United States Geological Survey, among other things, stated, in substance, that the next 10 years would in all probability see the exhaustion of our petroleum reserves to the point of endangering national defense. The doctrine of conservation was again expounded, and the delegates representing the various States were asked to form a compact among the States producing oil, which compact, when adopted and approved by Congress, would become the supreme law of the land; a commission would be appointed under the authority of the compact, with power to regulate and control the production of oil, to determine how much oil should be produced within the United States, and to allocate that production among the several oil-producing States.

When it became apparent that the real purpose of the meeting was not conservation in its real and accepted sense, but that the purpose was, by degrees and from time to time, to reduce the production of oil in the United States, and reserve our supplies in the ground for an indefinite period to come, and at the same time import our requirements in large part from foreign countries, the Colorado Springs conference adjourned, without having accomplished anything whatever toward the consummation of the purpose for which it was called.

However, this conference had far-reaching effects. It revealed, in all its hideousness, to the rank and file of the petroleum industry the true intent and purposes of those who had been fostering and promoting the so-called conservation program, to shut in domestic production, to stop development, to reserve our oil supplies in the ground, to be developed and used after the foreign supplies have been exhausted, and to turn the markets for petroleum in the United States (approximately 70 per cent of the markets of the world) over to a few large companies engaged in exploiting the petroleum reserves of South America and in importing the production thereof into the United States. If there has been any doubt as to these intents and purposes in the past, all doubt must now be dispelled, since under date of January 6, 1931, Secretary Wilbur, after having received an invitation from the Governors of Oklahoma and Kansas to participate in this conference, gave to the Associated Press an interview declaring himself against a tariff on oil, and saying, if he is correctly quoted by the press: "The chief result would be that the big companies, which now have many wells shut in and not in operation, would open them up, adding to the production. Overproduction is the basic ill of the industry."

It might be pertinent at this time to inquire what big companies have advised Secretary Wilbur in advance as to how they would defeat any beneficial results from a tariff on oil. The honorable Secretary also said: "In the future the country with the oil will dominate civilization. In it will be centered the wealth. America must conserve her supply. If we waste our oil reserves now we will pay foreign countries through the nose for every barrel we import later. If I were the landlord of this country I would see that we used as much imported oil as possible, and let the other fellow waste his reserves."

The last-quoted sentence is a full and complete admission of the purposes of those promoting the so-called conservation movement—to turn over to four companies, chiefly engaged in importing oil, the entire markets of the United States, even though it might mean the destruction of one of the greatest industries in the United States, the impoverishment of a section of the United States and of the people thereof, almost, if not quite, one-third the area of the entire country, with a population of some 22,000,000 of people, and a civilization built upon the oil industry.

In speaking thus does the honorable Secretary present to the public the views of the administration or is he simply holding fast to ideas and convictions acquired some years ago under circumstances which might then have excused the views, but which, in the light of subsequent events, are indeed archaic?

The conference at Colorado Springs having failed to bring forth a compact under which production could be controlled, the efforts, by voluntary cooperation and in some States under the provisions of State law, to curtail production, proceeded with remarkable success. Indeed, the figures are startling. We find that for the week ending August 24, 1929, the production of crude oil in the United States averaged 2,975,435 barrels per day, and for the week ending January 3, 1931, 2,082,100 barrels per day, or a curtailment in production in that period, brought about by the cooperation on the part of small and large producers alike throughout the country, of 893,335 barrels daily. We will produce in the United States this year approximately 100,000,000 barrels of oil less than we did in the year 1929, and while we have been reducing the domestic production 100,000,000 barrels the importers have, during 1930, brought into the United States and thrown upon our markets, duty free, more than 100,000,000 barrels of crude oil and refined products. In fact, the imports of gasoline during the first nine months of 1930 increased 125 per cent over the same period of 1929.

The report of the committee on economics of the American Petroleum Institute at its Chicago meeting, November 10, 1930, shows that each 5,000,000 barrels of gasoline imported would displace, for the six months ending March 31, 1931, 114,000 barrels daily of domestic production, while the report of the economics committee appointed by Secretary Wilbur to forecast the demand for petroleum products and ascertain and allocate oil production necessary to supply that demand for the six months ending March 31, 1931, shows that each barrel of gasoline imported displaces from the market 4 barrels of domestic crude. Crude oil, gasoline, and other refined products imported in the year 1930 have displaced from the market approximately 400,000 barrels daily of domestic production.

Since for a period of more than seven years there has been an intense propaganda fostered and promoted throughout the country in the daily press and in many of the Nation's most prominent magazines to convince the public of the early exhaustion of the petroleum reserves of the United States, it appears advisable at this point to outline briefly some of the former estimates of future oil production in the United States and later to call attention to the vast petroleum reserves which we actually possess. It would also be pertinent to inquire what forces and organizations, corporate or individual, have promoted and paid for this propaganda and who are the beneficiaries thereof. An inquiry of this nature properly and fairly conducted would, in all probability, go far toward explaining the so-called conservation movement and why it has been urged for a period of years.

In referring to the former estimates of future recoverable petroleum reserves let me state in advance that I do not wish to reflect whatever upon the good faith of the eminent engineers and other authorities making these estimates, but the recital of these estimates in the light of subsequent information will demonstrate

how easily even the most eminent and learned can be mistaken on this subject and will show further that, perhaps, the present advocates of the reservation of our petroleum reserves safely in the ground may be mistaken.

1908: David T. Day estimated minimum of 8,500,000,000 barrels. Estimated a maximum of 15,000,000,000 to 22,500,000,000 barrels from 1908 to 1930, inclusive, United States has produced 11,442,447,000 barrels, all of Day's minimum, plus 33 per cent.

1914: Ralph Arnold estimated future production at 5,700,000,000 barrels. From 1914 to 1930, inclusive, United States produced 7,719,396,000 barrels, all of Arnold's estimate, plus over 80 per cent.

1915: United States Geological Survey estimated future production at 7,600,000,000 barrels; 1915 to 1930, inclusive, United States has produced 9,813,633,000 barrels, all of that estimated, plus 29 per cent.

1921: Certain petroleum geologists of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists estimated future production at 9,150,000,000 barrels 1921 to 1930, inclusive, United States produced 10,719,222,000 barrels, nearly 85 per cent in 9 years.

1925: The committee of 11 appointed by the Federal Oil Conservation Board estimated future production from proven acreage on present methods 5,300,000,000 barrels; 1925 to 1930, inclusive, United States has produced from these properties and new pools 5,243,161,000, almost 99 per cent.

1930: In the year 1930 the United States, according to best estimates available at the present time, produced 901,000,000 barrels, compared with 1,005,598,000 barrels in 1929.

1859 to 1930, inclusive: From beginning to date the United States has produced a total of 13,149,090,000 barrels.

The production curve has been on the upgrade for several years. The country could have produced this year, had there been any demand for it, several hundred million barrels in excess of that which was produced.

In 1913 the United States produced 248,446,000 barrels. In 1929 Oklahoma alone produced over 253,000,000 barrels, or more oil than the entire United States produced in so recent a year as 1913. Oklahoma produces a billion barrels of oil each four years; it is capable of producing a billion barrels each year, if the demand called for such development. The same is true of Texas and California. It is highly probable that any one of the States of Oklahoma, Texas, and California can produce as much oil as the entire United States has produced to date. The oil resources of these States loom larger with each passing year, as deeper drilling and exploration work is done. These States are getting the development at this time, and have for a number of years last past. Other States would leap forward accordingly if development to a like extent were done within their borders.

The production of the United States has been swinging upward from the discovery of oil to the present time—a period of 72 years. When we consider that the vast domain from the Canadian line to the Gulf of Mexico, lying immediately east of the Rocky Mountains, as well as the Pacific Coast States, is potential oil territory, practically undeveloped and unexplored at this time, it is apparent that the production curve will be on the upward trend for many years to come; and that when said curve starts downward, if that day ever comes, we will produce from our then known reserves of oil as much or more oil than has been produced prior to the day when the decline curve will start on its downward course.

What I have heretofore said has been applicable to reserves of oil to be produced from oil wells. Let us now consider the vast reserves contained in the oil-shale deposits in the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Indiana, and other States. These deposits have been accurately surveyed, their oil content measured, and suffice it to say that in one deposit in Colorado alone the experts of the Government and the Colorado Bureau of Mines are agreed that there are 80,000,000,000 barrels of recoverable oil, should it ever become necessary to use the same.

We have in the coal deposits of the United States, which are more than 50 per cent of the coal deposits of the world, another great source of oil, so great indeed that it is difficult for the human mind to comprehend. By hydrogenation, oil and its derivatives, including gasoline, can be successfully produced from coal. It is not at all improbable that the perfection of this process, using coal, or the discovery of some other form of power, may within a few years make our present oil reserves all but valueless.

Secretary Wilbur and other protagonists of so-called conservation continually speak of wasting our oil reserves, when, as a matter of fact, we are only using them without waste. It is certainly not fair to continually tell the public that the American petroleum industry is wasting our valuable oil reserves when the country is utilizing this great natural resource for the creation of new wealth within the country. This is the oil age. Let us utilize our oil while it is yet valuable and before the discovery of some new form of power which may supersede oil for the generation of power. It is the utmost folly to continue on a program which perhaps was conceived with honesty of intentions, but which has outlived its usefulness and has become destructive in a superlative degree. Imagine for a moment, if you will, that men of similar vision to those promoting the so-called oil conservation policy of the present day had been directing the policies of the Government and the course of business from the foundation of our country until the present time; that, acknowledging our natural resources, the products of our mines, were irreplace-

able, they should be preserved for use at some distant day; and that, instead of developing our natural resources and utilizing them, we had clung tenaciously to a policy of so-called conservation or reservation, then this great country of ours would now be, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, an undeveloped expanse of almost unbroken wilderness; the few inhabitants thereof a pastoral people; the great civilization which we have builded and the great industrial and commercial development which has taken place as yet undreamed of.

What has made the United States the most enlightened, the most prosperous, the most advanced in all lines of endeavor of any nation in the world, has been the utilization of our natural resources. It would be just as logical to contend that we should import our iron ore, our lumber, our lead, coal, zinc, and other mineral products, reserving our supplies thereof in this country for some future national emergency, as it is to insist that we should import our requirements of oil. In fact, Russia is at this time willing to sell us all these things at a price less than our cost of production, and France, Great Britain, and other nations indebted to the United States would willingly pay their war debts by sending to us all of these products. How any patriotic American citizen can advocate such a policy is beyond comprehension.

We have heard a great deal and read more in the daily press and the oil journals concerning the overproduction of crude oil in the United States. As a matter of fact, during the last 12 years (1918 to 1929, inclusive), there has not been an overproduction in the United States, but there has been an oversupply. During that period we have imported 950,000,000 barrels of crude oil. During that period we lacked 600,000,000 barrels of producing as much oil as we consumed, but during the same period we added to storage of crude oil in the United States 350,000,000 barrels, which addition to storage, as may be seen by these figures, was occasioned almost wholly by importing more oil into this country than we had any need of, so that it clearly appears that the great burden upon the petroleum industry of carrying in storage nearly 700,000,000 barrels of crude and refined products was not occasioned by overproduction in the United States, but overimportation of foreign oils.

Now, let us inquire as to what effect the so-called conservation policy, coupled with the proration and curtailment movement and the importation of oil and refined products, has had upon the petroleum industry in the United States. The price of crude oil at the well has been reduced from time to time, until now it is being sold very much below the cost of production, except in isolated pools of new and large flush production, although, as before stated, we have reduced the production since the peak week in August, 1929, nearly 900,000 barrels daily, and the average price of crude oil throughout the country has, during the same period, been reduced more than one-third in price.

The case of Oklahoma is typical of all the rest. During the week ending August 24, 1929, the production of Oklahoma was 735,750 barrels per day, and for all of this production there was a ready market. Since then, by cooperative effort, and in line with the published suggestions of the Federal Oil Conservation Board and the requests of the major purchasers of oil in that State, the production has been reduced until in the week ending January 3, 1931, the State of Oklahoma actually produced only 448,900 barrels daily, or a reduction in the production during that period of 286,850 barrels daily. This has been accomplished in that State, in the face of the fact that the State could, with ease, supply sufficient oil to furnish the entire markets of the United States at the present time and for a long time to come from production already developed.

The proration movement and the curtailment of production in the various oil-producing States was inaugurated ostensibly for the purpose of stabilizing the petroleum industry, of preventing additions to storage, and balancing supply with demand. It has been a success only in so far as it has proved the ability of the industry to cooperate and accomplish curtailment of production. As production has been reduced, imports have absorbed the market demand theretofore supplied by domestic oil, and instead of the price of oil being stabilized, it has been steadily reduced until we are now almost upon a competitive basis, so far as prices are concerned, with cheap Venezuelan oil. One of two things must happen, and soon. Either imports of crude oil and refined products must be curtailed, and the price thereof equalized with domestic products by the imposition of an adequate tariff, or the petroleum industry must be permanently placed upon a competing basis, so far as price is concerned, with the foreign oil. In fact, this is being gradually brought about, and it will not be many months before the destruction of the petroleum industry in the United States is complete. Already some 30,000 small wells in northeastern Oklahoma and southeastern Kansas have lost their market, due to the inability of the Prairie Oil & Gas Co. to continue purchasing oil in the mid-continent field.

As stated by Mr. M. L. Requa, in opening the Colorado Springs conference, there are in the United States approximately 250,000 wells, with an average production of one barrel per day each. In addition to that, there are some 50,000 wells with an average production of five barrels per day each. In the aggregate, these wells have a settled production of over 500,000 barrels. They have been operated at a loss for more than three years. Many of them are being abandoned and plugged each week, under the benign influence of the present so-called conservation program. Ultimately these wells will all be lost, and in the name of conservation 300,000 small wells, with a daily production of 500,000 barrels, and with

recoverable reserves of oil of hundreds of millions of barrels, will have been destroyed. To save these wells would be true conservation, and it is within the power of the Federal Government to save them if it will. As they are being abandoned, the oil-field laborer, with his family, living on the lease and operating these wells, has been thrown out of employment. He knows no other kind of work, and under present conditions could not obtain employment if he did. There are literally thousands of these families at the present time dependent upon charity, and I can say, with feeling and in truth, that these men are native Americans, the kind that do not ask for charity—they do not wish to receive it—but who only claim the right by honest toil to support themselves and families.

Conservation has been tried as a remedy for the demoralization of the petroleum industry, and it has miserably failed and will continue to fail as long as imported oil and refined products absorb the market demand as fast as domestic production is reduced. The domestic petroleum industry is being ruthlessly destroyed in the name of conservation. The purchasing power of the oil-producing States has been reduced by hundreds of millions of dollars. The welfare of the petroleum industry is no longer of local significance. If one-third of the area of the United States, with a population of 22,000,000 of people, is impoverished to the point where the inhabitants can not purchase from the industrial and manufacturing sections of the country those things which a civilized and highly developed community need, there can be no industrial and commercial recovery in the United States for many years to come.

The civilization of the Southwest has been builded upon oil and the allied and kindred industries dependent upon the petroleum industry. If this industry is destroyed and the wealth and prosperity which it has created is transferred to some foreign country, this great civilization, until recent years prosperous and contented, will be destroyed, half of the people in the oil country must seek employment and outlets for their energies in other lines of industries already overcrowded. Most of them will be compelled to leave that country and the wonderful cities of the Southwest, builded for the most part by the oil industry, will become depopulated, and their magnificent office buildings become the roosting place of bats and sparrows.

We are met to-day in an attempt to work out a remedy for the appalling conditions in the petroleum industry with which we are confronted. All other principal industries of the United States, when suffering under similar conditions to that now prevailing in the petroleum industry, have been granted relief and given protection from foreign domination and control by a protective tariff. The principle of a protective tariff for industries being injured or destroyed by cheap foreign imports has become the settled policy of this Government. Both the Democratic and Republican Parties, in their platforms in the year 1928, strongly indorsed such protection to American industries, and I would again remind you that Vice President Curtis, in campaigning for the election of the present administration in a tour of the mid-continent field, in that year promised the industry tariff protection, and we all know that he was sincere in his declarations.

When it became apparent in the latter part of January, 1930, after a drastic cut in the price of crude oil, without any economic reason therefor, that those major companies engaged in importing crude oil and refined products in the United States had not given the full measure of cooperation promised by them in curtailing their foreign production and imports commensurate with the curtailment of production in the United States, and after those same interests believed it was too late for the domestic producers to obtain relief from Congress in the then pending tariff bill, a mass meeting of the oil industry was held in Tulsa, Okla., on January 29, 1930. A large delegation of oil men arrived in Washington on February 3, 1930, and presented to President Hoover and to the Congress their plea for protection to this great basic industry. The tariff bill had then passed the House, had been reported by the Finance Committee to the floor of the Senate, and the time was too short within which to thoroughly acquaint the House and Senate with the true condition of the petroleum industry. Since then conditions have steadily grown worse, and most of the things which were then told Congress would happen, if we were not given protection, have transpired. Congress did include in the tariff bill a provision directing the Tariff Commission to investigate and report to Congress the cost of Venezuelan oil and refined products delivered at Gulf and Atlantic ports, and the cost of domestic oil delivered at the same ports, and we are now expecting that report to be completed within a few days. Certainly by such a provision in the tariff bill it was the intention of Congress, should the facts warrant, to grant us relief and protection at the next ensuing session of Congress. The kindly reception accorded us at the last session, the generous support given in such a short time by Congress, is assurance that when the Members realize the true facts in connection with this question, relief and protection will be granted.

Congress has recently had under consideration relief bills under which it is proposed to give relief in various sections of the country to the farmers and others. In the oil-producing States, as is generally known, the farmers and landowners own one-eighth royalty in all the oil and gas produced. The producing oil companies hold under lease, for future prospecting, millions of acres in all the oil-producing States on which a rental, usually \$1 per acre, is being paid in addition to the bonus or purchase price of the leases themselves, from which the farmers in thousands of

instances have been able to pay off their mortgages and improve their farms, while the annual rental during recent years of crop failures and low prices for farm products has paid the taxes on their farms and in addition helped to support the farmers and their families. But with prevalent conditions in the petroleum industry, those engaged in the producing branch of the business, having had their resources and income severely reduced, are unable to continue paying these rentals, are surrendering the leases, and the farmers are being deprived of millions of dollars of income heretofore enjoyed by them. Literally thousands of men formerly employed in and near the oil fields are now idle, and the community funds raised in the adjacent cities and towns are being called upon to assist them. In addition the oil men themselves, in some districts where they are still able to raise the money, are contributing funds and, through committees, administering relief to the families of idle oil-field employees. How much better it would be for Congress to bring relief to the petroleum industry through a measure imposing a tariff on imported crude oil and refined products, which would bring revenue into the Federal Treasury, instead of by inaction on this measure making it necessary to appropriate millions from the Treasury for relief.

It was at one time argued by those importing crude oil into this country that there should be no tariff or other limitation on imports, because the crude oil was brought to the United States and gave employment to American capital and labor. This is no longer true. The Royal Dutch Shell has constructed and has had in operation for several years a refinery at Curacao, a Dutch island off the coast of Venezuela, the capacity of which has been increased in the last year to 250,000 barrels per day, while the Pan American Co., subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, has a refinery on the island of Aruba—also a Dutch island off the coast of Venezuela—of 110,000 barrels daily capacity. In addition to these, there are two smaller plants with an aggregate capacity of more than 30,000 barrels per day. Operating on cheap oil produced on the mainland, transported at a negligible cost to the refineries, and with transportation in tankers for the refined products from these huge refineries, the American petroleum industry is no longer able to compete in the world markets with them. He who can not visualize within the next few years the complete loss of our export market has little imagination indeed. The American companies now exporting oil to Europe will continue to export the same for some years to come, due to the fact that they have their own controlled outlets. It is from these refineries that the gasoline and other refined products come which absorb by leaps and bounds the market formerly supplied by Pennsylvania, New York, West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, California, and the great mid-continent field, and which has made necessary the proration program and the vast curtailment in the production of the United States.

The Department of Commerce maintains in the capitals and most of the principal cities of the world commercial attachés for the purpose of advancing the commercial interest of the United States, and a large part of their duties is in assisting to secure additional market outlets for petroleum products produced and refined in the United States. At the same time Secretary Wilbur, of the Interior Department and chairman of the Federal Oil Conservation Board, is devoting his energies to reducing domestic production and encouraging these other countries to send their petroleum products to the markets of the United States.

Is the oil industry of this country to continue in the curtailment of production in an ever-increasing degree while the output of Venezuela and other South American countries continues to absorb the domestic market without paying one cent of taxation to support the Government of the United States, the States, or the legal subdivisions thereof, whereas the domestic oil industry is the most heavily taxed of any industry in the United States, paying first in most States a gross-production tax of 3 or 4 per cent of all the oil and gas produced, a State income tax, a Federal income tax, an ad valorem tax, capital-stock tax, and other taxes too numerous to mention?

But those engaged in importing oil will contend that there should be no tariff on imports, because our exports of petroleum are greater in value than our imports. If this argument is sound and of compelling force, then Congress should, without delay, repeal the tariff bill in its entirety, for on examination we find that on the following products, to wit, iron and steel, semimanufactured; steel-mill products; iron and steel, advanced manufacture; electrical machinery; industrial machinery; office appliances and printing machinery; automobiles and other vehicles; animal oils and fats; manufactured cotton; manufactures of wood; pigments, paints, and varnishes; soaps and toilet preparations; photographic goods; scientific and professional instruments; and musical instruments, the imports during the calendar year 1929 were \$172,577,000, while the exports from the United States of the same products totaled \$1,725,111,000. During the same year the foreign value of imported crude petroleum and refined products was \$140,966,000, duty free, while the exports of the same products totaled, in American value, \$531,173,000. Imports of petroleum, both crude and refined, in 1929 amounted to approximately 110,000,000 barrels (about 10 per cent in barrels of the domestic production), while in 1930 it is estimated that the total number of barrels of imports of both crude and refined products will be slightly in excess of 100,000,000 barrels, and the estimated production of crude oil in the United States for the year 1930 slightly in excess of 900,000,000 barrels. The imports of crude oil in 1930 have been reduced as compared with the year 1929, but the

imports of gasoline and other refined products have been so greatly increased as to displace a much greater amount of domestic crude from the market than was the case in the year 1929.

Secretary Wilbur in his recent release to the Associated Press contended that since the imports were only about 10 per cent of our domestic crude production they were a negligible factor. But it is too well recognized as sound economics to require more than the mere statement thereof that a 10 per cent surplus of any commodity thrown on the market will demoralize completely the price structure of the whole supply, and this is what has occurred in the petroleum industry. A 10 per cent or even a 5 per cent surplus production of cotton, wheat, corn, or of any manufactured or industrial commodity has always brought about widespread depression and demoralization in the price structure of the commodity of which there is an oversupply on the market. Especially is this true in the case of oil and refined products when those engaged in producing and refining the same in Venezuela and other South American countries are able at will to increase the imports in any amount, so that the threat of the same continually hangs over the domestic market.

At the time of the last reduction in the price of crude oil in the mid-continent field, which reduction amounted to more than 25 per cent in the then average price, those companies posting the reduced price accompanied the same with the statement that it was made necessary because of competition. Certainly, it was not the competition of domestic production, because at the time of the posting of this crude price reduction, the cooperative movement to curtail production had reduced the same nearly 600,000 barrels per day in the United States; the companies posting the reduced prices for crude oil, after having promised full cooperation in the proration program, betrayed producers by withdrawing from storage 26,000,000 barrels of oil in the year 1930.

In recent months, imported gasoline has been sold in tanker lots in Atlantic seaports as low as 4 cents per gallon. Certainly it must have been the competition of this imported gasoline that made necessary the reduction in price of the domestic product. This reduction in the price of crude oil was followed throughout the United States by an average reduction in the wholesale price of gasoline (which was not passed on to the consumer) of 2 cents per gallon. Granting, for the sake of argument, that the difference in the values of our imports and exports of petroleum products, and the favorable trade balance of \$390,000,000 created thereby was all profit, even though that profit went to only four or five huge corporations, and keeping in mind that within the last year the price of 36 gravity Mid-Continent crude has been reduced more than one-third (50 cents per barrel), how long would it take at 50 cents per barrel, with a daily consumption in the United States at the present time of upward of 2,500,000 barrels of crude oil, to entirely account for said \$390,000,000 favorable trade balance from crude-oil production alone? And let us also ask how long it would take, at 2 cents a gallon (the amount of reduction in the wholesale price of gasoline in recent months) with a daily consumption of 1,250,000 barrels of gasoline, to account a second time for said \$390,000,000 of favorable trade balance?

While the argument is made that our exports of petroleum products exceed our imports thereof, we find, upon an analysis of the figures, that, taking into consideration the exports from the Pacific coast, to which there are no imports, or, if any, only a negligible amount, that there are more barrels of petroleum products imported to the Gulf and Atlantic ports than are exported from the same ports.

Again it is stated that there should be no tariff on imports of petroleum products because it would be detrimental to the interests of the consumers, the buyers of gasoline; that the consumers so far outnumber the producers and refiners and those employed in the petroleum industry that their interests are paramount. However, there seems to be little relation between the price of crude oil to the producer in the United States and the price of gasoline and lubricating oils to the consumer. This can be illustrated briefly by referring to the fact that in February, 1926, in 52 representative cities throughout the United States, the average price of gasoline at the filling station, exclusive of tax, was 18.09 cents per gallon, while the average price of crude oil of 36 gravity Baumé during February, 1926, in Oklahoma and Kansas was \$2.04 per barrel. The average recovery of gasoline by the refining methods then in use was 35 per cent, or 14.70 gallons per barrel. In 1929, the average price of gasoline at the filling stations in the same cities, exclusive of tax, was 18.39 cents per gallon, while the price of crude oil of 36 gravity Baumé in Kansas and Oklahoma was \$1.20, and the recovery of gasoline by improved refining methods had increased to 46 per cent, or 19.32 gallons of gasoline for each barrel of oil. The same relative price schedules obtained throughout the years 1926 and 1929. The price of gasoline to the consumer has not fluctuated in proportion to the price of crude oil.

Cheap imported fuel oil has caused the price of the domestic fuel oil in the refining centers of the Mid-Continent field to fall at times below 50 cents per barrel, thus bringing about a very wasteful utilization of this oil, which might better be saved for higher uses than fuel. This cheap fuel oil, coming into competition with coal, has brought serious distress to the coal industry throughout the country, which industry has been compelled to discharge from employment during the time this condition has prevailed, not less than 50,000 American laborers employed in the mines and in the transportation of coal. The unemployment problem, now receiving such diligent consideration by the adminis-

tration, might be greatly reduced by shutting out imports of cheap fuel oil, allowing the use of coal in many industrial and manufacturing centers, and thus bringing about a reemployment of thousands of miners who are now idle.

If the present program of so-called conservation is continued, and results in the shutting down of producing wells, and the cessation of development and exploration work, the known oil reserves of the United States will become practically valueless. The present owners, unable to hold the same without receiving any income therefrom will be compelled to sell them in a market demoralized because of this program. The purchasers who would be willing to buy under these conditions would be the same corporations who control and monopolize the production and marketing of oil throughout the world outside of the United States. It is acknowledged that there is a world monopoly on oil outside of this country. The markets of the United States are approximately 70 per cent of the markets of the world for petroleum products. If it is desirable that monopoly shall securely fasten its tentacles upon the petroleum industry of the United States, with the same grip it holds upon the remainder of the world, and if it is desirable that the consumers of the United States should ultimately pay the same price for gasoline and other petroleum products that are charged in Europe and other foreign countries, then the so-called program of conservation should be continued, even though it bring utter ruin in its wake to one-fifth of the population of the United States directly, and indirectly and in a lesser degree to the entire country; even though it shall cause an increase in ad valorem taxes in the oil-producing States, to make up for the taxes lost from the gross-production tax on oil and gas; even though its effect on general business, banking, and agriculture, through destruction of consuming power, shall be most serious; even though 20,000 oil producers, individuals, partnerships, and large and small corporations shall be put out of business, and their 800,000 employees and their families compelled to look for work in other lines; and even though the advocates of this policy in reserving the petroleum resources of the United States for future generations shall, after viewing the havoc wrought by their program, have a feeling of righteous accomplishment.

I have never contended that a tariff on oil is a panacea for all the ills of the industry. Were imports entirely eliminated we must still proceed with a sane, orderly program of development and operation of our oil fields, and, by cooperation, balance supply with demand as we have so ably demonstrated we can do—as we have done in the past two years.

I would like to say, in closing, that we should not be discouraged. We have won much support. The whole petroleum industry, the business and commercial interests, the farmers, and the landowners of the oil-producing States now present a solid front in demanding immediate relief and are militantly supporting the program for the exclusion of a foreign oil from the domestic markets, either through the instrumentality of a protective tariff or, if the political exigencies prevent that form of remedy, then by an embargo for a period of years forbidding any importation of oil products whatever.

The directors of the American Petroleum Institute, at its meeting in Chicago, November 10, adopted, by a majority vote, a resolution indorsing, in principle, a tariff on the importation of crude oil and refined products into the United States. On December 5, at the annual meeting of the directors of the General Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association, which association embraces the six States of Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Texas, Louisiana, and Arkansas, and contains in its membership representatives of most of the producing, refining, and marketing interests engaged in business in that district, adopted, with only one dissenting vote, a resolution strongly demanding a tariff on oil and refined products and directing the officers of the association to do everything in their power to secure that form of relief for the industry.

The Rocky Mountain Oil and Gas Association took similar action. All the local oil and gas associations throughout the country have done likewise. The Independent Petroleum Association of America, with membership in every oil-producing State of the Union, is a unit in demanding tariff relief. The chambers of commerce of most of the cities and towns in the oil States have likewise demanded a tariff on oil. A number of State legislatures, which have been in session since the depression in the oil industry has become acute, have memorialized Congress for this relief, the latest one to take such action being the Legislature of California, early this week. Various farm organizations have taken a decided stand in favor of a tariff on oil.

With this united and determined support I feel that Congress and the administration should and will give heed to our prayers and grant us that protection which only they can grant and thus prevent our complete demoralization and ruin. The historical and statistical facts justify, the social and economic conditions demand this relief. Certainly, with all this before them, our Government can find a way.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KETCHAM: At the end of line 23, page 71, strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following:

"Provided, That no money herein appropriated shall be available for engineering or economic surveys, or investigations of existing or proposed irrigation projects."

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a point of order on the amendment that it is not germane. I will reserve it if the gentleman wishes to be heard.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, there are, as the gentleman knows, certain studies being carried on under existing legislation, studies of old, established irrigation projects and proposed projects. If there is any money in this bill for that purpose, it would seem to be in this language, "for examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors." If there is no money in this paragraph for that purpose, the amendment proposed by my colleague is not effective. It is not legislation and it would be a nullity; but if there is the possibility under existing legislation of using this appropriation to carry on their irrigation studies, then the limitation proposed is only a limitation and is in order.

Mr. BARBOUR. There is money here for carrying on these surveys that we have been carrying on for the past several years and which were authorized and directed by the Congress in the rivers and harbors act and in the flood control act. These surveys do take into consideration irrigation, as well as power, navigation, and so on.

Mr. CRAMTON. So, as a parliamentary proposition, there is law authorizing them to carry on certain irrigation studies and that money is carried in this paragraph, although it is not conspicuous therein. All that my colleague seeks to do is to put on a limitation to prevent using it for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TILSON). Can the gentleman from Michigan show that there is any money carried in this paragraph that, without the amendment, could be expended for the purpose forbidden by the amendment?

Mr. CRAMTON. The chairman of the subcommittee has just so stated.

The CHAIRMAN. If it is germane to this paragraph, then the amendment is simply a negative limitation, and the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I invite the careful attention of the members of the committee to this amendment and what it is desired to accomplish by it. I do not think I need to remind you that one of the great problems we have to-day in this country is the problem of farm surpluses. You have just been hearing a story from the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] about the surplus in oil and the difficulties that are accruing to that great industry as a result of this great surplus. Those of us who are familiar with agriculture likewise know the situation there, and we have been doing our very best to limit the expansion of the work in irrigation and reclamation projects, particularly with reference to the new undertakings that promise to bring other areas of land into cultivation.

Mr. CARTER of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. If the gentleman will permit me to proceed just a moment or two, then I shall be pleased to yield.

In this connection may I say that in the introduction of this amendment there is no thought of preventing the completion of irrigation projects already authorized and under construction. The attitude of Congress as to further expansion of irrigation projects in the face of present farm surpluses is clearly understood. Notwithstanding the opposition to such expansion, friends of irrigation have endeavored to find some roundabout way by which surveys of projects can be made and reports filed. When these reports once get into the files it seems almost impossible to prevent further legislation simply because such surveys have been made. The War Department seems to be lending itself to this line of work which it seems clearly to me is wholly outside its proper field of operation, and it is to prevent such action that this amendment is offered.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. I understand the gentleman's amendment relates to surveys in connection with existing or proposed irrigation districts.

Mr. KETCHAM. The idea particularly is to prevent any expansion of irrigation.

Mr. BARBOUR. But the gentleman is striking at a very vital spot in my State and in the West generally in connection with existing irrigation districts that are short of water at this time; and the surveys that have been carried on by the Corps of Engineers of the Army have been most helpful in getting the facts and data upon which they can do something to save the land that they already have under cultivation.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. There is nothing in the limitation proposed that would prevent any irrigation district being carried on by the bureau established by the Government for the purpose of carrying on irrigation.

Mr. BARBOUR. But I am talking about a private irrigation district. The language of the amendment is "any kind of irrigation district."

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will yield, do I understand that the gentleman from Michigan contends that if the Army engineers are already on the spot doing this work it would not be more economical to have them complete the work rather than magnify the activities of another bureau?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will reserve my statement on the matter.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I would like to find out whether the gentleman knows what percentage of this \$60,000,000 might be devoted to the studies or the work he is trying to have discontinued?

Mr. KETCHAM. I want to be sure that none of it is, to be perfectly frank. I do not want to stand in the way of a proper exercise of the duties of the Army engineers, and I think the gentleman understands I am acting in absolute good faith.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Unquestionably the gentleman is acting in good faith; but may I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the Congress in 1925 authorized a study of all the navigable streams of the country and their tributaries, with a view to ascertaining their maximum possible development with respect to power, navigation, and flood control, which only incidentally involves irrigation. This study is not yet completed. It has revealed many facts that have been of great advantage to the country and calculated to add much to the Nation's commerce and its transportation systems. It is a most important work. It will cost, all told, perhaps some seven million dollars plus. There are a few very important projects in various parts of the country on which this study has almost been completed. Now, would the language of the gentleman's amendment prevent a continuation of these studies or of this work? If it would, it would be very serious, and, it seems to me, would be most harmful in its effect.

I know what the gentleman is trying to do, and down in my heart I feel his principle is right, but I am fearful his language will stop the work that is being carried on on these various streams all over the country.

Mr. KETCHAM. It may be that in a few instances some harm may be done by the action contemplated under this amendment, but I go back to the fundamentals involved.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. VESTAL). The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KETCHAM. Going back to the statement I made a moment ago, it seems to me that whatever merit there may be in the suggestion of the gentleman from Alabama that to-day the great question, the much larger question, that should demand our attention is the connection that this amendment has with the great business of agriculture itself. That is the one thing to which it is directed. I sincerely hope that every person here interested in that particular phase will think it over and be glad to give his support to this amendment. Because it does seem to me that the principle we have announced time and time again that you can not accomplish by indirection what you can not accomplish by direction ought to have application here. It is only to restrict the War Department from going into a field unrelated to its river and harbor or flood-control work that the amendment is introduced.

Mr. McFADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. I yield.

Mr. McFADDEN. I came into the Chamber after the gentleman introduced his amendment. I presume it is to stop the further duplication in irrigation projects.

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes; as far as the War Department is concerned.

Mr. McFADDEN. Are they contemplating surveys of the Columbia River Basin project?

Mr. KETCHAM. They are getting under way, and I would be glad to restrict any further survey in that direction.

Mr. McFADDEN. The reason I asked is that I visited there a short time ago and there is a program that at the next session they will strive to bring about legislation for that development. I understand that a fund of \$100,000 has been raised for lobbying by the local people to foist this development on Congress and to insure the passage of the Columbia River Basin project.

Mr. KETCHAM. I have not had that particular fact brought to my attention. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I desire to submit some views on this general subject recently published in the Farm Journal of Philadelphia.

It is to this employment of Federal money to further new reclamation schemes at this time to which I object and I can see no essential difference whether it is Uncle Sam's cash in the Reclamation Fund that we take or Uncle Sam's cash in the Treasury. In either case it is money belonging to all the people east and west. Surely it is an injustice to employ the funds belonging in part to each Michigan farmer to increase his competition, decrease his market, and depress his selling prices.

It is a crowning injustice when the Government is asked to step in to finance new projects that private capital will not touch. It should be plain, it seems to me, that the willingness of private capital to invest is the true test of the soundness of the enterprise. Capital is not the timid creature it is sometimes represented. It is venturesome enough at times. And when a reclamation scheme is pronounced too risky for private investors to touch that should be conclusive proof that the enterprise is economically unsound.

I can not escape the conclusion that it is contrary to sound public policy to expand our irrigation program by launching new projects. It is clear to me that it is unjust to taxpayers in general and to the farmers of the country in particular. Furthermore, I am unable to understand how it can be of advantage to more than a small percentage of the most exceptional settlers on the new projects. I have examined at some length the surveys already made of the Columbia Basin project. Here the cost of purchasing, fitting, and equipping an 80-acre farm is estimated at from \$7,500 to \$15,000 exclusive of cost of water rights. Less than 10 per cent of the settlers seeking such homes have as much as \$5,000 to invest. Facing new problems and uncertainties, the chances of even the few are far slimmer than they would be with similar investment in land already available in old established communities.

A word of assurance needs to be given those timid souls among us who see in a suspension of reclamation some dan-

ger to our food supply. Since 1920 there has been a marked decrease in the number of farms and in farm population in the United States. In spite of this, however, production has increased due to increased efficiency in farm work and the rapid mechanization of farm operations. In addition to this many millions of acres of plow land are idle in all sections of the country. Both these factors amply offset the demand of our growing population for foodstuffs.

Early in this article I stated that Congress had thrown some safeguards around these appropriations by providing that new projects must be analyzed and favorably reported upon by the Reclamation Service. That is a precaution of a sort, but it is not, in practice, a very effective one. For some reason it seems to be felt in Congress that if an investigation is once authorized and a favorable report brought in, Congress is under some kind of obligation to proceed with the project. It seems to be the idea that Congress could not have made a mistake in ordering the investigation and the Reclamation Service could not be wrong in recommending it. There is no inherent reason why this should be so, but in practice that is the way it works out. In some way Congress regards the project as having been started when the investigation is made.

The only way to prevent this, it seems to me, is to put down our foot firmly when proposals for new surveys are made. Let us have no more investigations, large or small, promising or unpromising, at least until farming has had a chance to catch up with its present competition.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, how is the time being divided? The opponents of the amendment ought to have something to say about it.

Mr. CRAMTON. I thought that we were changing the customary order, and certainly we are not in a position to shut off debate, for that rests in the hands of my friend from California. My thought is to accomplish the development of facts, and it occurred to me that possibly the gentleman from California would like for me to make my statement before he made his, so that he might get a better understanding of it.

Mr. BARBOUR. I can have no better understanding than I have at the present time. The gentleman's statement will not influence me, but I am willing that the gentleman should make his statement. I think the amendment is uncalled for, and I think I can demonstrate it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Michigan for five minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] brought this matter to my attention a few minutes ago. I think what my colleague wants to accomplish, and certainly what I desire to accomplish, is to challenge the attention of Congress to a highly wasteful, extravagant, undesirable duplication of effort. There is no desire to interfere with any desirable project under way. It may be that the suggestion fails to adequately protect everybody's interest. If so, if the House sustains the principle involved of nonduplication of effort, the gentleman from California, before it gets through Congress, will be able to shape up the language to meet their views.

What I want to bring to the attention of the House is what I mentioned before. Last June I made a speech in the House, and I presented certain letters. In early July I brought it to the attention of the Budget and asked them to make an investigation, because, in my judgment, that is one of the real functions of the Budget, to study the activities of various branches of the Government, to the end that there may not be undesirable duplication of effort. I expected that I would have the information to submit to the subcommittee at the hearings.

Mr. CARTER of California. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CRAMTON. I can not yield now. I want to present my statement without interruption. I want to present some facts in an orderly fashion. The Budget referred it to the

Bureau of Efficiency, and the first thing I could get out of that bureau was after the hearings were closed before the gentleman's committee. I have a letter this morning from the Director of the Budget stating the matter will be gone into with care.

In the legislation referred to language is adopted that if followed out reasonably is quite proper and perhaps desirable. That is to say, they were authorized in a study of rivers not only to study the needs of navigation and of flood control but also the questions of power development and irrigation. A reasonable exercise of that authority could not be complained of when through knowledge of a certain work they can as an incident of that work make that study; or, if it is essential in order to determine the navigation possibilities the questions of irrigation require consideration, such study should be made. No one objects to their doing that, but here is what they are doing. I call attention to some of the extreme cases, because I want the gentleman from Alabama to join with us and get this thing fixed in the way that it ought to be. They went into the field of the Columbia Basin. Within a week or two after Congress two years ago refused to contribute one-half of the cost of a further field study the Army proceeded to contribute 100 per cent of the cost. In defiance of the action of Congress in refusing 50 per cent, they contributed 100 per cent, amounting to \$100,000 or more.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Is not the gentleman fearful that this language will stop the study already undertaken and yet incomplete as to these various rivers?

Mr. CRAMTON. Some of them ought to be stopped, and some of them never should have been commenced.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. This is not a subject that will be settled to-day, but I want gentlemen to think about it. In a letter under date of July 11, 1930, addressed to the Chief of Engineers, General Brown, Doctor Mead, the Commissioner of Reclamation, in appealing to them to get onto a reasonable basis, wrote as follows:

One of these cooperative investigations carried out in 1923-24 was a study of the lower Platte and tri-county projects along the river from North Platte to Hastings, Nebr. Detailed reports were prepared and have been considered by committees in Congress. Now, the engineers from your Kansas City office have taken up the review of these projects, have copied our reports, made surveys, and are expecting, so I am informed, to review the engineering on economic aspects as presented in our report. This is being done without any conference with the authorities of reclamation work in Washington.

If you want an economic study on the feasibility of an irrigation project, what is the sense of referring it to the Army? Is that the place to go for a real economic study of irrigation, whatever may be the case as to engineering studies? Then he said further:

The Army field work in itself is understood to be largely supplemental in character, but the preparation of reports and subsequent consideration of construction feasibility is a duplication. In order to acquaint themselves with the work that has gone before, the various engineer officers have equipped themselves at heavy cost with duplicates of reports, maps, and plans on file in our offices.

The difference in resulting conclusions by the two departments will beget confusion and unhealthy impressions by the general public.

Suppose that the Reclamation Bureau, with no background of knowledge of ocean-going commerce or of tides or shipping, should send its representatives to the United States engineer office in San Francisco, proceed to copy plans, estimates, and reports of the harbor improvement of that city, and then work out a scheme for an independent and different development. These irrigationists with no background of knowledge necessary to wise judgment would be in very much the same position with the engineers of the War Department formulating plans for the irrigation and

agricultural development of much of the country now being included in these studies. I am curious to know whether you would regard such activity of the Reclamation Bureau as duplication or worse.

Let me give you one other illustration of the ridiculous extreme to which they are going: They are not only making studies that are necessary and incident to the study of navigation and flood control but they went up into Montana recently with a large force into an area where no one has yet asked for an irrigation project. They sent their engineers in and they made an engineering and an economic study on what is called Musselshell—some creek, and if anybody here knows what it is or where it is I would like to have him tell me.

Mr. LEAVITT rose.

Mr. CRAMTON. Oh, of course, the gentleman from Montana knows, but I did not notice that he was present.

Mr. LEAVITT. It is an area in which there should be constructed an irrigation project for the preservation of existing livestock and a farming settlement.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does it present any great navigation possibilities?

Mr. LEAVITT. No; except in connection with streams below.

Mr. CRAMTON. They have gone in there and developed the plan and are all ready to report to Congress practically their recommendation as to the construction of an irrigation project up in the Musselshell in Montana, far from navigation. What will be the result? First, there is a widespread demand now in the West that instead of these projects being constructed out of the reclamation fund and they repaid by the settlers they be built as other river and harbor works are built—100 per cent at the cost of the Federal Government. That is the first thing. Next, they come in without the proper background of the economic questions involved in irrigation and present a report. The reclamation fund has not the money to-day to build that even if it is recommended, and they were not contemplated for many years to come; and in the meantime this definite report recommending it from the Army is there on file, and fortifying any local demand for early development.

Conditions will greatly change before construction time arrives, and that money is first, a complete waste, whatever is spent in their study; and in the second place, as to economic studies, they do not have any great standing in Congress, Army officers passing on questions of agriculture and economics; and in the third place, it does present all of the complications as to 100 per cent cost by the Government. Now, what we should do is to get an expression by the Congress condemning these unnecessary investigations carried on by the War Department, and that will be accomplished by this amendment if it is agreed to by the committee. Thereafter my friend from California, who is familiar with some aspects of it, will no doubt see that the amendment is amended and modified so as not to hurt anyone.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, this matter has been brought several times before the House of Representatives by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON]. A condition exists that he seems to be much exercised and concerned about, and he is the only one, so far as I know, who has objected, until his colleague came in to-day and offered this amendment.

Now, what is the situation? The Board of Army Engineers has been making surveys for the purpose of determining potential power, navigation, irrigation, and any necessary flood control on these streams. It has been doing that because in two acts of this Congress we have placed that duty upon the Board of Army Engineers. They did not seek it. In the rivers and harbors acts and the flood control act we placed the duty upon them to do this work. If the gentleman from Michigan does not like that—and he is the only one I know of who does not like it—why does he not

amend those acts instead of coming here each time an appropriation bill is considered on this floor and getting exercised about the Board of Army Engineers?

His amendment would prohibit the expenditure of any of this money for engineering or economic surveys or investigations of any existing or proposed irrigation projects. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] knows of, but he is not considering this amendment, certain irrigation projects, large private irrigation projects, that were built by the farmers themselves with their own money, and they have not asked the Federal Government for a single dollar.

Those irrigation projects, several in our State and in other parts of the West, pay their own bills. They have not asked the Federal Government for a cent, but they do have a water problem, and the Board of Army Engineers has gone in there in these surveys and they are the first ones, let me say, who have done anything for them in the way of giving assistance. The Board of Army Engineers has done this under the direction we have given in those two acts, and with the money carried in the War Department appropriation bill, and they have made surveys that have been a real help and a real benefit to those farmers who are trying to do something for themselves. The gentleman from Michigan would cut those people off from any assistance under this bill.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. I yield.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I am not at all concerned about any dissension between the Board of Army Engineers and the Reclamation Department.

Mr. BARBOUR. There is none, so far as I know, let me say to the gentleman. The only one who seems to know of any dissension is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

Mr. McDUFFIE. There is no desire on the part of the engineers to take over the work of Doctor Mead's department.

Mr. BARBOUR. Absolutely none.

Mr. McDUFFIE. But some of these reports, and they are very important, ordered to be made by Congress, are in the making, and I am fearful that under this language they could not proceed to print one that was ready for printing and send their report to Congress.

Mr. BARBOUR. I do not believe they could.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I think it is a dangerous procedure. Nobody has said how much of this fund might be expended for the work that is incidental to flood control, made by the engineers now. Nobody seems to know. It may be a mere pittance, but it is not really a part of their problem, it is true, and yet it is incidental to their problem. The engineers can not give a true and complete picture of any stream without giving some notice to the irrigation projects on that stream.

Mr. BARBOUR. I think the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. McDUFFIE] is absolutely correct.

Dr. Elwood Mead was in my section of the country last year studying this problem for the benefit of these privately owned irrigation districts. Colonel Robbins was the Army engineer who was there making this study of the streams. The information that I received was to the effect that there was the utmost harmony between Colonel Robbins and Doctor Mead.

Mr. PARKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. No; not now.

Mr. PARKS. Just for a question.

Mr. BARBOUR. Very well.

Mr. PARKS. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's position. I am amazed that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] should object to a survey. I want to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR] if there is any Member in this House who has made more surveys and traveled farther and made more investigations than the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] in the last 10 years?

Mr. BARBOUR. Knowing that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] had raised this question and had complained about the Board of Army Engineers before on the floor of the House, when the Board of Army Engineers was before the committee we took some time to ask a few questions about their relations with the Reclamation Service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR] has expired.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does the gentleman think it is accurate to say that I am the only one interested in this?

Mr. BARBOUR. I say that the gentleman from Michigan is the only one who has objected, so far as I have heard.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have already quoted from Doctor Mead's letter to General Brown, and I have other letters, later ones, to the same effect.

Mr. BARBOUR. Now, let me quote from General Brown to Doctor Mead—not directly to Doctor Mead, but in regard to Doctor Mead. General Brown said, in the hearings at page 149:

General BROWN. I have been to see the chief of the Reclamation Service, in order to avoid any duplication, and explained to him what our general purposes were and told him what we were going to do, what data we were going to get, and explained to him that it would be made available to him, any of it, in case he wanted it, and that as to any data he might have that was applicable to what we proposed to do we would be glad to get without doing work ourselves.

Mr. BARBOUR. And they have cooperated in this work?

General BROWN. They have cooperated in this work; yes. He was perfectly agreeable, and there is a perfect understanding, so far as I know, between the Reclamation Service and the Corps of Engineers on that basis.

The idea of full and complete cooperation is there, to the effect that when we are ordered to do something by Congress we are going to do it, and what he does not get we will get, and what he has we will make use of.

Mr. BARBOUR. There is no dissension?

General BROWN. None whatever.

Mr. BARBOUR. Or pulling back between the two departments in reference to that work?

General BROWN. There is none whatever. He understands what we are doing. We agree with him that if there is anything he has to say in reference to our reports he is at liberty to say it, and we will attach that to the reports.

Then it was called to General Brown's attention that there had been some criticism on the floor about this relationship between the Army engineers and the Reclamation Service. General Brown said:

I noticed the account of that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Before that had happened I had made a personal call on the chief of the Reclamation Service and explained the matter to him and told him what we desired to do in the way of cooperation, in that we had no desire whatever to create any duplication, and I thought there was a perfect understanding. Since that time I have seen them again, and we have given him full information as to what we were doing so he could take advantage of it, or, if he had anything that would be of advantage to us, we could use any part of it.

Then this question was asked:

Then, as far as the Director of the Reclamation Service is concerned, there is a perfect understanding?

And General Brown said:

There is a perfect understanding, I believe.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. I yield.

Mr. KETCHAM. Did the questioning of General Brown develop to what extent the Army engineers had gone into a survey of irrigation projects?

Mr. BARBOUR. They have been directed by Congress to make those surveys. General Brown says there is certain information in the hands of the Reclamation Service. Now, instead of going out and doing that work over again, they went to the Reclamation Service and said, "We want to cooperate with you. If you have anything we can make

use of turn it over to us, so we will not do the work over again, and anything we get we will turn over to you."

Mr. KETCHAM. To be perfectly plain and frank now, is there any evidence developed anywhere that General Brown went out and undertook surveys, or that there was any contemplation that he would, in areas where the action of the Congress had clearly indicated it did not propose to have such surveys made by another department?

Mr. BARBOUR. I never heard of such a thing.

Mr. KETCHAM. Does the gentleman think that is true or is not true?

Mr. BARBOUR. I have no information whatever.

Mr. KETCHAM. If that were true, the gentleman would be opposed to it?

Mr. BARBOUR. Absolutely.

Mr. KETCHAM. Then the gentleman should be in favor of this amendment.

Mr. BARBOUR. I am opposed to this amendment. This amendment goes further than that and strikes at those privately owned irrigation districts which are trying to do something for themselves, and the only help they have had, so far as I know, is this help from the Board of Army Engineers in these surveys.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Congress refused to vote to authorize half the expense by the Federal Government in the Columbia Basin, and within two weeks of that refusal they took 100 per cent out of their fund. Is not that what the gentleman refers to?

Mr. BARBOUR. I am not referring to that at all. I am referring to the effect it will have on certain irrigation districts if this amendment is adopted. I do not think any Member of this House wants to do anything of that kind to a privately owned irrigation district; districts that are endeavoring to pay their own bills and have had a little help from the Board of Army Engineers. [Applause.]

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I dislike especially to disagree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON]. He is undoubtedly the most valuable friend of reclamation in the House, but I rise in opposition to the amendment. I do so particularly because the Musselshell project in Montana was referred to by the gentleman from Michigan, and I am greatly interested in its development. He used that project and situation and referred to it as an illustration of why this amendment should be adopted. I wish to use the same project and situation as a reason why the amendment should not be adopted.

I have on my desk to-day quotations from a letter of the Commissioner of Reclamation in reply to a request that the economic study of that project be made by the Reclamation Service. In reply to that request the statement was made that there was a report prepared, I think, in 1902 or 1903, in which it was stated that a suitable reservoir site had not been discovered. Mr. Chairman, during this last fall I went over that project personally and visited two adequate reservoir sites. That proves to me conclusively that that old information of almost 30 years ago is not complete and does not meet the present situation.

But there is a cogent reason why that study can not be expected at this time by the Reclamation Service. That reason is that they do not now have in their possession the funds necessary to carry on this and various other studies similar to this one on the Musselshell River and like those referred to by the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR]. There is a lack of money in the reclamation fund for that purpose. Now, under this provision in this Army bill, while the flood-control studies are being made and while the navigation studies are being made, that other needed information can be at least partly also gathered. We shall thus be advancing these irrigation projects needed as a part of the development of the western country.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is it not true that not only are the appropriations for investigations by the Reclamation Service limited but also that the amount of money—because the projects have failed to pay the charges due—in the fund has become so limited that not only can they not take on the gentleman's project as a new project but they can not continue their established 10-year program?

Mr. LEAVITT. I am very sorry to say there does exist that shortage of money, but at the same time that very fact is an added reason for allowing this work to go forward under this Army appropriation.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is the gentleman aware that there is a definite demand in some quarters that \$5,000,000 be taken out of the Federal Treasury to advance to the reclamation fund in order to carry on the existing program?

Mr. LEAVITT. That has not been advanced to Congress in any bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. But such a demand has been made?

Mr. LEAVITT. That suggestion has been made, but there is no demand of that kind before the Congress.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is the gentleman aware of the demand that has developed somewhere in the West and definitely expressed in some quarters that as a result of these Army studies these projects should be built not by the Reclamation Service but by the Corps of Engineers, and that they ought to be paid for out of Federal funds as river and harbor projects are paid for?

Mr. LEAVITT. That has not come to my attention.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have that evidence.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I will say to the gentleman that that will not be done soon by this Congress, in my judgment.

Mr. LEAVITT. I have stated that that has not come to my attention, but it would not surprise me to have almost any kind of proposal grow up in the minds of the interested people.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Why, certainly.

Mr. LEAVITT. But I do not expect that to be soon done by the Congress, based on my knowledge of how things are accomplished here and what is possible. At the same time, I will say that with the shortage of reclamation funds many of these things that would ordinarily be fully justified out of the reclamation fund unfortunately can not be done just at this time from that source.

The gathering together of this information, however, may make evident the feasibility of proposed projects, even if it proves necessary ultimately to finance some of them under State laws or otherwise. In any event the gathering of this information is valuable and should not be stopped through the adoption of this amendment, because, let me say again, it can not be carried forward now under the Reclamation Service, because the funds are not available. There surely can not be any duplication of work which can not be done except under this one Army appropriation.

Mr. McFADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. I yield.

Mr. McFADDEN. Will the gentleman explain to the committee why this examination of Musselshell Creek in Montana was started at this time? What were the reasons for that?

Mr. LEAVITT. Of course I and others requested it, but it was undertaken under the authority and direction of this Congress in connection with studies of flood control and navigation. The Musselshell is a tributary that becomes ultimately a part of the great Missouri and Mississippi River system. They are carrying on a complete study to develop the entire situation in that drainage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment again reported?

The Clerk again reported the Ketcham amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TILSON). The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's request comes too late.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute to withdraw an objection I recently made to the request of a Member.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for one minute.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, a further explanation of the situation has convinced me that my objection, although possibly fundamentally right, might do an injustice to a great many Members who desire information that can only be obtained by them through the columns of the RECORD. So without compromising my principle or my practice in any way, I withdraw my objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I renew my request, inasmuch as the gentleman from Massachusetts has withdrawn his objection, to incorporate as an extension of my remarks made to-day, the statement of Mr. Wirt Franklin, president of the Independent Oil Producers of Oklahoma, made at a meeting in the caucus room of the House Office Building this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

(The statement occurs in connection with the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] previously made.)

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and will only detain the committee a moment.

I want to get some information from the chairman of the subcommittee. What is the total amount that will be available for river and harbor work for the fiscal year 1932, including the emergency appropriation made before the holidays? Is it \$82,500,000 or \$71,000,000?

Mr. BARBOUR. Eighty-two million five hundred thousand dollars—\$60,000,000 here and \$22,500,000 in the emergency bill.

Mr. McDUFFIE. But, as the gentleman will doubtless recall, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] said when that bill was under consideration that there was \$11,000,000 duplicated, and I remember asking the question on the floor and I would like to read the gentleman his answer.

Mr. BARBOUR. I think I can explain that.

Mr. McDUFFIE. The gentleman's answer was not altogether clear to me, but I would judge it means that \$71,000,000 would be available as the total amount for 1932 instead of \$82,500,000.

Mr. BARBOUR. In the emergency bill and in these estimates there were certain projects, the money for which overlapped, but we carry in this bill \$60,000,000 and in the emergency bill \$22,500,000; and General Brown said that there would not be any duplication in the work but that this money would enable him to speed up the work and do work that he otherwise could not have done, because there is just that much more money that he has in the appropriations.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Let me read just this short paragraph. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] said:

This twenty-two and a half million dollars is just that much more than they would have gotten if it were not for this bill. The \$11,000,000 is not duplication, but just that much more money for the same projects between this bill and the regular bill.

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. McDUFFIE. So there is just \$11,000,000 more for the same projects?

Mr. BARBOUR. No; \$22,500,000 more.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will permit, I remember the discussion in the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations when the emergency bill was before that committee—

Mr. McDUFFIE. If the gentleman from Michigan and the chairman of the committee feel sure that the amount is

\$82,500,000, I am very happy, and I have no desire to interfere with the program.

Mr. CRAMTON. Since neither appropriation is limited to any particular projects and it is all available for any work authorized by law, of course, the sum total is available, and while the \$22,500,000 may take care of \$11,000,000 that would have been in this bill, that releases \$11,000,000 out of this amount to go further than was otherwise planned.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made by including an article that I have prepared in support on the subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made in the RECORD, and also to include some correspondence.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Emergency fund for flood control on tributaries of Mississippi River: For rescue work and for repair or maintenance of any flood-control work on any tributaries of the Mississippi River threatened or destroyed by flood, in accordance with section 7 of flood control act, approved May 15, 1928 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 33, sec. 702g), \$400,000.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have an interesting letter here from the Director of the Census in reference to the unemployment census, which I believe will be of interest to every member of the committee, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the Bureau of the Census is taking a census of the unemployed in several cities of the United States to check up the unemployment situation in comparison with the situation of to-day with that of last April. The census starts to-day, I believe.

In the meantime many cities have provided for temporary employment. In other words, they give employment for three days in the week instead of giving relief money direct. The temporary relief employment is a cover only to charitable aid. It is not productive or gainful employment.

The unemployment situation has created in many cities the apple-peddling system. Now, I want to call the attention of the House that in this census that started to-day the Census Bureau is going to count the unemployed men selling apples as gainfully employed. They are going to count the men that are receiving this little relief—I do not want to use the word charity, but it is charity—this little relief as a gainful employment.

Now, such a census will not be of much aid to us in getting an accurate picture of the real unemployment situation in these cities.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It may aid the Red Cross.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. What we want is an actual picture of the unemployment situation. We can not give instructions to the supervisors. If time permitted, I would ask this House to instruct the Director of the Census by resolution to cause an accurate and intelligent enumeration of the unemployed to be made. I do not know what we can do to get an accurate, intelligent census, but I appeal to every Member of the House who is interested in having an intelligent census of the unemployment situation, to call this matter to the attention of the Census Bureau, so that these men receiving temporary relief and selling apples shall not be counted as men gainfully employed, but properly classified as able and willing to work but unemployed.

Mr. PARKS. What difference does it make whether there are 5,000,000 or 10,000,000 men out of employment unless they are going to do something for them?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Well, if there are 5,000,000 men or 10,000,000 men unemployed we ought to know it. It seems to me it is an idle gesture, if we are going to take an unemployment census to check up the conditions now as compared to last April, that any such system as I have described be followed.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may put into the RECORD at this place a letter that I received from the Director of the Census, such as I have described.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,  
Washington, January 13, 1931.

HON. F. H. LA GUARDIA,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LA GUARDIA: I have received your letter of January 10 relative to the question of the classification in the census of unemployment of men who are receiving relief employment of three days a week paid from charitable funds and men selling apples as a makeshift occupation.

The question of what persons should be included in the census of unemployment received very careful consideration when the census was taken last April. We found that there was no well-established or generally accepted definition of the term "unemployed," and we realized that any general definition would be difficult to apply consistently under the practical limitations of census taking. It was necessary to have some test that could be readily applied. The best practical solution of the problem seemed to be to obtain a record for every person who usually followed a gainful occupation and for any reason, whether on account of sickness, disability, inability to find work, or disinclination to work, was not actually working at the time of the census. Accordingly the instructions issued to the enumerator were to make an entry on the unemployment schedule for every gainful worker who was not at work on the day preceding the enumerator's visit, or on the last previous working day in case the preceding day was not a regular working day. Other questions were included to develop the reasons why the person was not working and how long he had been without work.

It is necessary that the results of this special census about to be taken should be comparable with the census taken last April if we are to have a correct index of the trend of unemployment since that time. It was decided, therefore, that the instructions, definitions, and schedules of inquiries used at this census should be identical with those used in the earlier census. Therefore the enumerators were instructed "to enter on the schedule the name of every gainful worker who was not at work on the last regular working day" preceding the enumerator's visit. But he is not to include any person who is working at a gainful—that is, money-earning—occupation without regard to whether that occupation is permanent or only temporary. This, I believe, is the only workable principle on which a satisfactory census could be taken, and in accordance with that principle we ruled that people engaged in selling apples, either as a temporary or a permanent occupation, are actually working at a gainful—that is, a money-earning—occupation at the time the census is being taken, and therefore are not to be returned on the unemployment schedule.

Very truly yours,

W. M. STEUART, Director.

The Clerk read as follows:

Flood control, Sacramento River, Calif.: For prosecuting work of flood control in accordance with the provisions of the flood control act approved March 1, 1917 (U. S. C., title 33, sec. 703), as modified by the flood control act approved May 15, 1928 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 33, sec. 704), \$1,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I have examined the hearings, and find there is an actual expenditure for the Sacramento of \$400,000, of which \$200,000 is available, but there is nothing in the hearings to show the actual expenditures. This is the same amount appropriated last year. Has the gentleman any private information how the fund is expended?

The hearings show that prior to the flood control act of 1928, the State and local authorities were contributing two-thirds, and since then the ratio has been changed so that the Federal Government is contributing one-half and the State one-half.

Mr. BARBOUR. That was changed in the flood control act of May 15, 1928. My understanding is that the total amount the Federal Government will be called upon to contribute under that act is \$17,600,000, and it is being appropriated now at the rate of \$1,000,000 a year. The project is now about 50 per cent completed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of the \$17,600,000, how much up to the present time has been appropriated?

Mr. BARBOUR. The project is about one-half completed. This is the third million dollars that has been appropriated under the latest enactment.

Mr. STAFFORD. We have been appropriating for a long time for this work. The limit of appropriation of \$17,600,000 is not fixed in that act?

Mr. BARBOUR. That was superseded by the flood control act, which made a new arrangement. In 1925 we appropriated \$500,000, and in 1926 \$550,000, in 1929 \$400,000, and in 1930 we came in under the new act.

Mr. CARTER of California. Under this new act does not the Federal Government contribute one-third and the State of California one-third and the local interests one-third?

Mr. BARBOUR. As I understand it, the State pays one-half of the cost of the levee, and some of the control work, furnishing rights of way, and the United States pays half of the channel improvement and control, and for one-half of the levee.

Mr. STAFFORD. The statement of General Pillsbury in the hearings is explicit, in answer to the direct question repeated several times by the chairman of the committee, Mr. BARBOUR, that the State contributes only one-half and the National Government one-half.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JAMES], is absent from the city on official business. He suggested to me the advisability of letting the RECORD show that the Committee on Military Affairs is aware that there are certain provisions in the bill that are not predicated upon authorizations. The subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs has been very earnest in its efforts to insist that there shall be previous authorizations, but, of course, there are many activities that have been carried for so long without any fundamental authorization that it would be unfair and unwise to make the point of order even if it would lie. There are also some provisions to which the point of order would lie that we think ought to continue in the bill. For the purposes of the RECORD we desire to show that on page 20, line 21, there is no authorization, but that there is a bill pending, H. R. 2671, to constitute authorization; also on page 20, line 21, the bill H. R. 2744 is pending for the purpose of constituting authorization, and the same is true in respect to the following places and bills: Page 21, line 15, H. R. 2967; page 27, line 9, H. R. 4193; page 28, line 17, H. R. 4196; page 34, line 4, H. R. 12202; page 37, line 7, H. R. 2678; page 39, line 1, H. R. 4200; page 39, line 17, H. R. 4195; page 41, line 23, H. R. 10372; page 48, line 9, H. R. 2676; page 54, line 17, H. R. 3147; page 57, line 27, H. R. 2900; page 62, line 2, H. R. 2675.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Have those bills been introduced in this Congress or have they been pending for some time?

Mr. McSWAIN. They have been introduced in this Congress. The subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Military Affairs understand it. It is our intention and desire whenever we have a day to seek to have these bills acted upon.

The Clerk read as follows:

For maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal: Salary of the governor, \$10,000; purchase, inspection, delivery, handling, and storing of materials, supplies, and equipment for issue to all departments of the Panama Canal, the Panama Railroad, other branches of the United States Government, and for authorized sales; payment in lump sums of not exceeding the amounts authorized by the injury compensation act approved September

7, 1916 (U. S. C. title 5, sec. 793), to alien cripples who are now a charge upon the Panama Canal by reason of injuries sustained while employed in the construction of the Panama Canal; in all, \$9,359,808, including \$1,000,000 for continuing the construction of the Madden Dam across the Chagres River at Alhajuela for the storage of water for use in the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, together with a hydroelectric plant, roadways, and such other work as in the judgment of the Governor of the Panama Canal may be necessary, to cost in the aggregate not to exceed \$15,500,000, and including \$500,000 for completing the construction of a ferry and highway near the Pacific entrance of the Panama Canal as authorized by the act approved May 27, 1930; together with all moneys arising from the conduct of business operations authorized by the Panama Canal act: *Provided*, That in addition to the amount herein appropriated, the Governor of the Panama Canal is authorized to enter into contracts for continuing the construction of the Madden Dam and accessories, as herein specified, to an amount not to exceed \$11,250,000.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of calling attention to an amendment adopted yesterday or the day before, which appears on page 2105 of the RECORD. That amendment provides:

None of the appropriations in this act shall be available for the purchase for use within the continental limits of the United States of any raw materials not produced within the continental limits of the United States or any articles or supplies containing materials or manufactured of materials not produced within the continental limits of the United States, except (1) articles produced or supplies purchased for experimental purposes; (2) crude rubber and components of ammunition or of mixed metals not procurable within the United States; and (3) as may be authorized expressly by law.

I fully approve of having the War Department buy raw materials in the United States; but it seems to me that we are running into a world of trouble by requiring them to have raw materials in manufactured goods bought in the United States, or to show that they are. For instance, take this book, or this rug, or these chairs. It is almost impossible to determine after the article is manufactured whether the raw materials that entered into it were produced here or elsewhere. I fear that this will cause a great deal of trouble. I call the attention of the committee to this for the purpose of giving notice that when it comes up in the House I am going to ask for a special vote upon it and a reconsideration of it, with the idea that next year or some time later something may be worked out that will require the purchase of raw materials without the confusion of having to ascertain whether the raw materials in manufactured goods are produced in the United States. As it is now, with this amendment it seems to me that it will cause a great deal of trouble.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Does not the gentleman think the War Department can work out some simple rule for handling that situation without any trouble? It does seem that the language is not sufficiently involved or so restrictive that it can not be handled and administered properly. I do not think there is the least trouble about it, and I think if the gentleman will consider it from that angle he will have a different attitude toward it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice from a reading of the amendment that the language is positive and mandatory, that no article shall be purchased where it contains any raw material not produced within the continental limits of the United States. They would not be able to purchase a newspaper, because any number of newspapers contain sulphite pulp that is made abroad.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. That is the danger of it and it seems to me this should go over until next year and something could be worked out that would enable the War Department to properly handle the matter.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment for the purpose of calling attention to one fact. I had intended calling attention to the

fact that the paragraph at the bottom of page 72 and the top of page 73 is substantially the same as the amendment adopted the other day known as the Taber amendment at another place in the bill as a substitute to the Collins amendment. Should not this language, which is not as broad, be stricken from this part of the bill?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes. That was stricken out in the whole Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. STAFFORD. I beg the gentleman's pardon, I have the committee print.

Mr. BARBOUR. The whole committee struck it out and then it went in again as the Taber amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was the judgment of the full committee that no inane provision like this should be incorporated?

Mr. TABER. No. The Secretary of War sent a letter up there that morning and the committee did not have a chance to thoroughly digest that letter and the committee struck it out, but when it was fully considered, it was put in again.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the period of digestion on the part of the committee on matters that come before it?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. From the War Department, one second.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the committee did strike it out regardless of the period of digestion?

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the amendment as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARBOUR: Page 75, line 14, strike out the semicolon and insert a period.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 15593) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any of the amendments?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the amendment appearing on page 1237 of the RECORD, known as the Taber amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? [After a pause.] If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment, substitute by Mr. TABER, page 25, line 25: Insert the following: "None of the appropriations in this act shall be available for the purchase for use within the limits of the United States of any raw materials not produced within the limits of the United States or any articles or supplies containing materials or manufactured of materials not produced within the limits of the United States, except (1) articles produced or supplies purchased

for experimental purposes; (2) crude rubber and components of ammunition or of mixed metals not procurable within the United States; and (3) as may be authorized expressly by law."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill, and I offer the following motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York offers a motion to recommit, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion by Mr. LA GUARDIA: I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 55, line 25, before the period insert:

"Provided further, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for any expense incident to any form of military instruction or training in high schools which require or compel students to undergo any form of military instruction or training."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LA GUARDIA) there were—ayes 11, noes 92.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-five Members are present, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 59, nays 271, not voting 101, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

YEAS—59

Box	Dowell	Kading	Rankin
Brand, Ohio	Evans, Mont.	Ketcham	Robinson
Burtness	Frear	Kvale	Romjue
Busby	Goldsborough	LaGuardia	Sabath
Cannon	Greenwood	Ludlow	Schafer, Wis.
Christgau	Hall, N. Dak.	Mead	Selvig
Christopherson	Halsey	Mooney	Short, Mo.
Cochran, Mo.	Hill, Wash.	Morehead	Sinclair
Collins	Hope	Morgan	Sparks
Cooper, Wis.	Howard	Nelson, Mo.	Sproul, Kans.
Cox	Huddleston	Nelson, Wis.	Stafford
Crosser	Hudson	Palmisano	Strong, Kans.
Davis	Hull, Morton D.	Parks	Welsh, Pa.
Dickinson	Hull, Wis.	Peavey	Williamson
Dominick	Jones, Tex.	Rainey, Henry T.	

NAYS—271

Abernethy	Campbell, Iowa.	Doxey	Graham
Ackerman	Campbell, Pa.	Drane	Granfield
Adkins	Carter, Calif.	Drewry	Green
Allen	Carter, Wyo.	Driver	Gregory
Allgood	Cartwright	Dunbar	Griffin
Andrew	Chalmers	Dyer	Guyer
Arentz	Chindblom	Eaton, Colo.	Hadley
Arnold	Chiperfield	Edwards	Hall, Ill.
Aswell	Clague	Elliott	Hall, Ind.
Ayres	Clark, Md.	Ellis	Hall, Miss.
Bacon	Clark, N. C.	Englebright	Hancock, N. Y.
Bankhead	Clarke, N. Y.	Erk	Hancock, N. C.
Barbour	Cochran, Pa.	Eslick	Hardy
Beedy	Cole	Estep	Hare
Beers	Collier	Evans, Calif.	Hartley
Black	Colton	Finley	Hastings
Bland	Condon	Fisher	Hess
Blanton	Cooke	Fitzgerald	Hickey
Bloom	Cooper, Ohio	Foss	Hill, Ala.
Bohn	Cooper, Tenn.	Free	Hoch
Bolton	Coyle	Freeman	Hogg, Ind.
Bowman	Crail	Fuller	Hogg, W. Va.
Boylan	Cramton	Gambrill	Hooper
Brand, Ga.	Crisp	Garber, Okla.	Hopkins
Briggs	Cross	Garber, Va.	Houston, Del.
Brigham	Crowther	Garner	Hull, William E.
Britten	Dallinger	Gasque	Igoe
Browning	Darrow	Gibson	Irwin
Brumm	Davenport	Gifford	James, N. C.
Buchanan	Denison	Glover	Jeffers
Burdick	De Priest	Golder	Jenkins
Butler	DeRouen	Goodwin	Johnson, Ill.
Byrns	Douglas, Ariz.	Goss	Johnson, Nebr.

Johnson, Okla.	McMillan	Ragon	Taylor, Colo.
Johnson, Tex.	McReynolds	Ramey, Frank M.	Temple
Johnston, Mo.	McSwain	Ramseyer	Thatcher
Jonas, N. C.	Maas	Ramspeck	Thurston
Kahn	Magrady	Ransley	Tilson
Kelly	Manlove	Reed, N. Y.	Timberlake
Kendall, Ky.	Mapes	Reilly	Tinkham
Kendall, Pa.	Martin	Rich	Treadway
Kinzer	Merritt	Rogers	Turpin
Knutson	Michener	Rutherford	Vestal
Kopp	Miller	Sanders, N. Y.	Vincent, Mich.
Korell	Milligan	Sanders, Tex.	Vinson, Ga.
Kurtz	Montague	Sandlin	Wainwright
Lambertson	Moore, Ky.	Seger	Walker
Lanham	Moore, Ohio	Seiberling	Wason
Lankford, Ga.	Mouser	Shaffer, Va.	Watres
Lankford, Va.	Murphy	Shott, W. Va.	Watson
Larsen	Nelson, Me.	Shreve	Welch, Calif.
Lea	Newhall	Sloan	White
Leavitt	Niedringhaus	Smith, Idaho	Whitehead
Leech	Nolan	Snell	Whitley
Lehlbach	O'Connor, Okla.	Snow	Whittington
Letts	Oldfield	Somers, N. Y.	Wigglesworth
Linthicum	Oliver, Ala.	Speaks	Willson
Loofbourov	Owen	Spearing	Wingo
Lozier	Palmer	Sproul, Ill.	Wolfenden
Luce	Patman	Stalker	Wolverton, W. Va.
McClintic, Okla.	Patterson	Strong, Pa.	Woodruff
McClintock, Ohio	Perkins	Summers, Wash.	Woodrum
McCormack, Mass.	Pittenger	Sumners, Tex.	Wright
McDuffie	Pratt, Harcourt J.	Swanson	Wurzbach
McFadden	Pratt, Ruth	Swick	Wyant
McKeown	Pritchard	Swing	Yates
McLaughlin	Purnell	Taber	Yon
McLeod	Quin	Tarver	

## NOT VOTING—101

Aldrich	Dickstein	Johnson, Wash.	Rowbottom
Almon	Dorsey	Kearns	Schneider
Andresen	Doughton	Kemp	Sears
Auf der Heide	Douglass, Mass.	Kennedy	Simmons
Bacharach	Doutrich	Kerr	Simms
Bachmann	Doyle	Kiefner	Sirovich
Baird	Eaton, N. J.	Kunz	Smith, W. Va.
Beck	Esterly	Langley	Steagall
Bell	Fenn	Lindsay	Stevenson
Blackburn	Fish	McCormick, Ill.	Stobbs
Browne	Fitzpatrick	Mansfield	Stone
Brunner	Fort	Menges	Sullivan, N. Y.
Buckbee	French	Michaelson	Sullivan, Pa.
Cable	Fulmer	Montet	Taylor, Tenn.
Canfield	Garrett	Moore, Va.	Thompson
Carley	Gavagan	Norton	Tucker
Celler	Hale	O'Connor, La.	Underhill
Chase	Haugen	O'Connor, N. Y.	Underwood
Clancy	Hawley	Oliver, N. Y.	Warren
Connery	Hoffman	Parker	Williams
Connolly	Holaday	Parsons	Wolverton, N. J.
Corning	Hudspeth	Pou	Wood
Craddock	Hull, Tenn.	Prall	Zihlman
Culkin	James, Mich.	Rayburn	
Cullen	Johnson, Ind.	Reece	
Dempsey	Johnson, S. Dak.	Reid, Ill.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Browne (for) with Mr. Johnson of South Dakota (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Hawley with Mr. Cullen.  
 Mr. Connolly with Mr. Oliver of New York.  
 Mr. Reid of Illinois with Mr. Doughton.  
 Mr. Menges with Mr. Gavagan.  
 Mr. James of Michigan with Mr. Tucker.  
 Mr. Eaton of New Jersey with Mr. Corning.  
 Mr. Bacharach with Mr. Moore of Virginia.  
 Mr. Taylor of Tennessee with Mr. Fulmer.  
 Mr. French with Mr. Brunner.  
 Mr. Underhill with Mr. Garrett.  
 Mr. Wood with Mr. Almon.  
 Mr. Fenn with Mr. Rayburn.  
 Mr. Johnson of Washington with Mr. Lindsay.  
 Mr. Stobbs with Mr. Prall.  
 Mr. Buckbee with Mr. Montet.  
 Mr. Reece with Mr. Sirovich.  
 Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Steagall.  
 Mr. Haugen with Mr. Warren.  
 Mr. Sullivan of Pennsylvania with Mr. Sullivan of New York.  
 Mr. Fort with Mr. Williams.  
 Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey with Mr. Doyle.  
 Mr. Chase with Mr. O'Connor of Louisiana.  
 Mr. Aldrich with Mr. Pou.  
 Mr. Simmons with Mr. Kemp.  
 Mr. Hoffman with Mr. Dickstein.  
 Mr. Beck with Mr. Celler.  
 Mr. Kiefner with Mrs. Norton.  
 Mr. Cable with Mr. O'Connor of New York.  
 Mr. Doutrich with Mr. Stevenson.  
 Mr. Stone with Mr. Underwood.  
 Mr. Culkin with Mr. Smith of West Virginia.

Mr. Johnson of Indiana with Mr. Kerr.  
 Mr. Clancy with Mr. Kunz.  
 Mr. Holaday with Mr. Canfield.  
 Mr. Esterly with Mr. Carley.  
 Mr. Parker with Mr. Dorsey.  
 Mr. Zihlman with Mr. Hudspeth.  
 Mr. Schneider with Mr. Connery.  
 Mr. Andresen with Mr. Bell.  
 Mr. Fish with Mr. Hull of Tennessee.  
 Mr. Simms with Mr. Mansfield.  
 Mr. Hale with Mr. Kennedy.  
 Mr. Craddock with Mr. Fitzpatrick.  
 Mrs. McCormick of Illinois with Mr. Douglass of Massachusetts.  
 Mr. Kearns with Mr. Auf der Heide.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. BARBOUR, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WARREN (at the request of Mr. HANCOCK of North Carolina), for to-day, on account of illness.

## ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 447. Joint resolution making an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the public resolution entitled "Joint resolution for the relief of farmers in the drought and/or storm stricken areas of the United States," approved December 20, 1930.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2865. An act granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of Wyoming and Idaho with respect to the boundary line between said States.

## JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 447. Joint resolution making an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the public resolution entitled "Joint resolution for the relief of farmers in the drought and/or storm stricken areas of the United States," approved December 20, 1930.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 16, 1931, at 12 o'clock noon.

## COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Friday, January 16, 1931, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

## COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m.)

District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Legislative appropriation bill.

Navy Department appropriation bill.

## COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

(10 a. m.)

Oil shale lands.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

777. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to increase the limits of cost of construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

778. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation pertaining to the legislative establishment under the Architect of the Capitol for the fiscal year 1932 in the sum of \$2,833 (H. Doc. No. 718); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

779. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill authorizing an appropriation for the erection of a memorial to the officers and men of the United States Navy who lost their lives as the result of a boiler explosion that totally destroyed the U. S. S. *Tulip* near St. Inigoes Bay, Md., on November 11, 1864, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 5295. An act authorizing an additional per capita payment to the Shoshone and Arapahoe Indians; without amendment (Rept. No. 2274). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LETTS: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 13528. A bill providing for payment of \$100 to each enrolled Chipewewa Indian of Minnesota from the funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2275). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FULLER: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 13249. A bill to authorize the acceptance of a tract of land adjoining Hot Springs National Park, Ark., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2276). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 10515. A bill to ratify certain leases with the Seneca Nation of Indians; with amendment (Rept. No. 2278). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 14055. A bill to make permanent certain temporary judgeships; with amendment (Rept. No. 2279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LUCE: Committee on the Library. H. R. 15931. A bill to provide for the relocation of statue of Gen. John A. Rawlins; without amendment (Rept. No. 2280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LUCE: Committee on the Library. H. R. 16078. A bill to amend the act approved June 2, 1930, providing for a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt for his leadership in the cause of forest conservation; with amendment (Rept. No. 2281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 4425. An act to amend section 284 of the Judicial Code of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. RANSLEY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 10003. A bill to authorize full settlement for professional services rendered to an officer of the United States Army; with amendment (Rept. No. 2272). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 13856. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay E. C.

Sampson, of Billings, Mont., for services rendered the Crow Tribe of Indians; with amendment (Rept. No. 2273). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EATON of Colorado: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 14491. A bill for the relief of J. N. Gordon; without amendment (Rept. No. 2277). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOHN: A bill (H. R. 16205) authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of the Crooked and Indian Rivers, Mich.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16206) providing for a preliminary examination and survey of the harbor at Naubinway, Mackinac County, Mich.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 16207) to prohibit the recovery of any indebtedness to the United States from either the principal or the interest due and payable to any depositor from the military or naval service whose savings were intrusted to the Government under provisions of existing law; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MORTON D. HULL: A bill (H. R. 16208) to procure and erect in the city of Washington the group of statuary known as The Indian Buffalo Hunt; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MILLIGAN: A bill (H. R. 16209) to amend paragraph (1), section 201, World War veterans' act, 1924; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SINCLAIR: A bill (H. R. 16210) to provide for the conducting of livestock breeding, growing, and feeding experiments in connection with the Dickinson Field Station at Dickinson, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JAMES of Michigan (at request of the War Department): A bill (H. R. 16211) to authorize the attendance of personnel and animals of the Regular Army as participants in the Tenth Olympic Games; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 16212) providing for examination and survey of Lake River, Wash.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16213) to provide for distribution of tribal funds of the Puyallup Indians of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. OLIVER of New York: A bill (H. R. 16214) granting retirement to certain former employees of the Treasury Department; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 16215) authorizing the sale of surplus power developed under the Grand Valley reclamation project, Colorado; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 16216) to increase the limit of cost of construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 16217) to amend section 32 of the act of Congress approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm loan act, but adding thereto a section to be known as section 32-A; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 16218) to amend subsection (a) of section 1 of an act entitled "An act for the acquisition, establishment, and development of the George Washington Memorial Parkway along the Potomac from Mount Vernon and Fort Washington to the Great Falls, and to provide for the acquisition of lands in the District of Columbia and the States of Maryland and Virginia requisite to the comprehensive park, parkway, and playground system of the National Capital," approved May 29, 1930; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 16219) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. REED of New York: Resolution (H. Res. 335) for the consideration of H. R. 12901 to extend the provisions of certain laws relating to vocational education and civilian rehabilitation to Porto Rico; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 336) for the consideration of S. 2113 to aid in effectuating the purposes of the Federal laws for promotion of vocational agriculture; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CRISP: Resolution (H. Res. 337) to amend Rule II by adding two new paragraphs; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 338) to amend paragraph 4 of Rule XIII; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 339) to amend Rule XXVII, providing a discharge rule; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WAINRIGHT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 467) to provide for the erection of a suitable memorial to the Second Division of the American Expeditionary Forces; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. PATMAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 468) to authorize loans, in certain emergency cases, for use in making payments on loans of Federal land banks and joint-stock land banks; to the Committee on Agriculture.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

Memorial from the State Legislature of the State of Idaho, urging the Congress of the United States of America to give careful consideration to and enact such legislation as will permit the United States Government to pay to counties and State the taxes that would ordinarily be assessed against lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 16220) for the relief of John A. Rapelye; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BOHN: A bill (H. R. 16221) for the relief of Cadreau Bros.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 16222) for the relief of Mark Parker, alias Harry E. Parks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GIFFORD: A bill (H. R. 16223) for the relief of Charles A. Gettys; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GREENWOOD: A bill (H. R. 16224) granting an increase of pension to Martha Hattery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARE: A bill (H. R. 16225) for the relief of Claud J. Adams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOGG of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 16226) granting an increase of pension to Barbara A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 16227) for the relief of M. K. Stephens; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORTON D. HULL: A bill (H. R. 16228) granting a pension to Anna Buckingham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 16229) for the relief of Helena C. VonGroning and Stephan VonGroning; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 16230) for the relief of George Hamlin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 16231) granting a pension to Florence Bonnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16232) granting a pension to Carrie Boyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 16233) granting an increase of pension to Anna Gault; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 16234) for the relief of the Charles LeRoy estate; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OLIVER of New York: A bill (H. R. 16235) granting an increase of pension to Hattie V. Holdsworth; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 16236) granting a pension to Doris Wehrs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATMAN: A bill (H. R. 16237) for the relief of the heirs of F. P. Brower, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 16238) granting an increase of pension to Rena N. Kerr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 16239) granting an increase of pension to Mary Treadway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 16240) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca A. Decker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALKER: A bill (H. R. 16241) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITLEY: A bill (H. R. 16242) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth F. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOLVERTON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 16243) granting an increase of pension to Frank C. Nelson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16244) granting an increase of pension to Loverney J. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8602. By Mr. ANDREW: Petition from various residents of Massachusetts, favoring passage of so-called antivivisection bill, H. R. 7884; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8603. By Mr. BACON: Petition signed by residents of Long Island, urging the enactment by Congress of House bill 7884, providing for exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8604. Also, petition of the East Rockaway Yacht Club, of Long Island, in support of passage of dog antivivisection bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8605. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of residents of the seventh congressional district of California, urging passage of House bill 7884, for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8606. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of residents of New York State, urging the passage of House bill 7884, providing for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8607. By Mr. HILL of Washington: Petition of 35 citizens of Spokane, Wash., urging passage of House bill 7884, for the exemption of dogs from vivisection; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8608. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of 30 citizens of Glenwood, Minn., representing the business men, professionals, and railroad employees, urgently requesting consideration of adequate and proper motor-bus regularity legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8609. Also, petition of members of the Carl A. Hanson Post, No. 321, Elbow Lake, Minn., unanimously favoring leg-

islation to pay off in full adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8610. By Mr. O'CONNOR of New York: Resolution of the Long Island Chamber of Commerce, New York, opposing transfer of all or any part of the New York State canal system to Federal Government under terms and conditions of rivers and harbors act of July 3, 1930; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

8611. By Mr. PRALL: Petition of citizens of the eleventh district, New York, urging the passage of House bill 7884 for the exemption of dogs from vivisection; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8612. By Mr. SHOTT of West Virginia: Memorial of Council of Jewish Women, of Charleston, W. Va., urging legislation permitting admission of wives and children of

alien residents; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8613. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Louis J. Cohn, secretary Elliott Varnish Co., 4525 Fifth Avenue, Chicago, Ill., urging the defeat of any legislation tending to increase the rate of first-class postage from 2 cents to 2½ cents per ounce; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

8614. Also, petition of William E. Rasch, 3622 North St. Louis Avenue, Chicago, Ill., president International Brotherhood of Electric Workers, Local No. 134, urging the passage of House bill 10821; to the Committee on Education.

8615. Also, petition of A. B. Miller, 7825 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., urging Congress to pass House bill 10821 for better and more vocational training; to the Committee on Education.